"Response to the Book 'Tahrir' Regarding the Statement of Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah on the Issue of Seeking Supplication from the Deceased" by Ayman bin Saud Al-Anqari
And Clarification of His Mistake Concerning Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah."

Translation:

In the name of Allah, and peace and blessings be upon the Messenger of Allah, his family, his companions, and those who follow him:

The author mentions in the introduction that he will gather what he can from the words of Ibn Taymiyyah regarding the ruling on seeking supplication or intercession from the deceased. For example, someone saying, "O Messenger of Allah, pray to Allah for me..." or "O Hussain, ask Allah to intercede with the Messenger." The author attributes ten statements to Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, claiming he made a mistake in understanding them, attributing to him the view that all of that is absolute major shirk (associating partners with Allah).

The response will be both general and detailed. Initially, the commentary will focus on the issue of supplication, followed by addressing the topic of seeking intercession from the deceased. The latter is a branch of the former and shares the same details.

Seeking help from Allah, I begin by saying that this research lacks clarity on the point of contention. Those opposing the Sunnah claim that it is about "requesting supplication," not "supplication" itself. Despite this, they do not assert that seeking supplication from the deceased is minor shirk. They limit this concept to two conditions:

1. The supplication must be near the grave. By this, they intend to prevent those seeking supplication from doing so away from the grave, believing that the deceased is knowledgeable about the condition of the one who asks, even if absent, and is able to hear despite being absent. This is considered shirk in the attributes, as understood from Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, Imam Ibn Abdul Hadi, and stated by Imam Isma'il ad-Dahlawi, the martyr.

2. The supplication must be free from the belief in negative intercession in the Quran. Scholars explain this by saying that the intercessor should have evidence from Allah, proving that their request and mediation will not be rejected. Some scholars express it by stating that Allah has made the reluctant like the one who coerces. Others describe it as Allah accepting their intercession out of desire and fear. The meaning is the same, intending the analogy to be close to the image: making the intercessor with Allah like a minister with a king. This is considered shirk in lordship, as explicitly stated by Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim.

This meaning is summarized in what Sheikh Bakr Abu Zaid mentioned in his book "Tashheeh al-Du'a" and called this image "innovative mediation." He stated in the ruling of the issue regarding its origin and responses to it—which is the best detailed explanation of the issue of seeking supplication from the deceased.

Translation:

"Second Type: Asking the Living to Pray for the Deceased. In this type, there are two branches:

1. Asking the living to pray for the deceased who is absent from his grave. This involves requesting that the living person invokes Allah's prayers for the deceased. There is a unanimous agreement among Muslims that this type constitutes major shirk (associating partners with Allah). It is considered similar to the shirk of Christians towards Mary and her son, Jesus (peace be upon them), in their prayers, as they claim that both Mary and Jesus are aware of the actions of the worshipers.

Here is the link to the printed version of the book that is being refuted:
[Link to the printed book]

And here is another link to a different version:
[Link to another version of the book]"

Translation:

"Type Two: Asking the Living to Pray for the Deceased. In this type, there are two branches:

1. Asking the living to pray for the deceased when present at the gravesite, similar to what the worshippers do, addressing the deceased with requests such as, 'O so-and-so, pray to Allah for me in such-and-such a way.' Muslims unanimously consider this as a form of intermediary innovation and a means leading to associating partners with Allah, as well as supplicating to the deceased besides Allah, diverting hearts away from Allah. However, this type becomes major shirk if the supplicant seeks intercession and partnership from the occupant of the grave, similar to the acts of polytheists, who worship their deities to get closer to Allah."

[Reference: Page 250-251 and the implications of the sheikh's words regarding the first branch will be clarified in its appropriate place later.]

The point of contention is whether asking the deceased for supplication at their gravesite is the same as asking the living. This differs from what the author Ayman Al-Anqari suggested.

By clarifying this, objections based on several statements attributed to Ibn Taymiyyah will be dismissed, as they are irrelevant to the core issue.

The scholar Mahmoud Shukri Al-Alusi, may Allah have mercy on him, stated: "It is self-evident that the supplication of worship is an invocation for something only Allah can do, whether directed towards the living or the dead. The opening of Al-Mannan is the completion of Minhaj Al-Tasis, page 291: [T: Omar bin Ahmed]. Reflect on his statement: 'It is self-evident,' meaning it does not require intellectual effort.

If turning towards the deceased is major shirk because it involves an act of worship directed to someone other than Allah, then its ruling remains the same when directed towards the living in the same context. If worship is diverted to someone other than Allah, whether the recipient is alive or dead, it necessitates rejecting major shirk with the deceased in the living world. If it persists in the living world, it should be considered rejected speech, and it follows that the implications of major shirk differ between the living and the dead. No one argues otherwise. Therefore, if asking for supplication from the deceased is a clear act of supplicating to the dead, then the ruling of asking for supplication from the living must also be considered major shirk. However, this is not stated by any rational person, and the absence of textual evidence and consensus supports this, as it falls within the capabilities of the created and is not among the actions exclusive to Allah – actions of lordship. This indicates the presence of a significant and influential difference between the two.

If someone asks: Why is seeking help from the deceased considered major shirk, while seeking help from the living is permissible?"

Answering this, seeking help from the living, merely because they are alive, is not permissible. Similarly, the prohibition of seeking help from the deceased is not solely because they are dead. The rulings apply to both states of being, whether alive or dead. The explanation lies in the fact that seeking help from the living falls within the natural causes that humans can utilize, unlike seeking help from the deceased. Seeking help from the deceased is an explicit form of supplication and falls under one of the four types of shirk in lordship mentioned in the Quran: "Say, 'Call upon those whom you claim [to be gods] besides Allah. They possess not an atom's weight in the heavens or on the earth, nor have they any share in them, nor is there for Him any supporter. And intercession does not avail with Him except for one whom He permits.'" (Quran, Surah Saba: 22-23).

Evidence supporting this is found in the verses: "And when harm touches you upon the sea, those that you call upon vanish from you except Him [Quran, Surah Al-Isra: 67]." Additionally, Allah says, "And when adversity touches man, he calls upon Us, whether lying on his side or sitting or standing; but when We remove from him his affliction, he continues [in disobedience] as if he had never called upon Us to [remove] an affliction that touched him [Quran, Surah Yunus: 22]." Another verse states, "And when waves come over them like canopies, they supplicate Allah, sincere to Him in religion [Quran, Surah Luqman: 32]." In these verses, Allah describes seeking relief from hardship, which is the essence of seeking help, as supplication.

The renowned commentator Ibn Jarir al-Tabari, may Allah have mercy on him, explained the last verse, saying, "When these people were overwhelmed by waves like shadows and feared drowning, they turned to Allah in supplication, sincerely obedient to Him without associating partners with Him, without calling upon anyone else, and without seeking help from anyone but Him." This concludes his specific commentary on a general concept. As long as seeking help from the deceased is a clear form of supplication, it falls under the Quranic statement, "Say, '"Invoke those you claim [as deities] besides Allah." And so, since this meaning is present in seeking help from the absent living, its ruling is also major shirk, even though it is associated with the living.

These are two distinct requests due to their connection to two different powers:
1. A request for something that is within the capability of none but Allah, and this pertains to the acts of lordship, which are among the attributes of the exalted Lord. This type of request constitutes major shirk, whether sought from the living or the dead.
2. A request for something within the capability of the living according to the laws of Allah in the universe. This is not shirk in essence, as it does not pertain to the attributes of the exalted Lord.

On the other hand, the areas of major disbelief (kufr) in explicit rulings involve contradicting the Quran and Sunnah in matters that constitute major disbelief after becoming aware of them. This apparent disbelief, expressed through either spoken words or physical actions, leads to concealed disbelief, either rooted in heart convictions, such as denial, or in heart actions, such as arrogance and turning away. The existence of concealed disbelief is determined by traits like hypocrisy.

Footnote:

2. Denying disagreement among Muslims is a generalized statement that Sheikh Bakr Abu Zeid Ibn Taymiyya followed in one of his reports on this matter, explaining it as follows: If the companions and the successors are meant, they unanimously agreed not to engage in such acts. If the intention is the later Imams followed by the adherents, none of them mentioned its desirability, obligation, or correctness. If the intention is the followers of later scholars, a group of later jurists from the Shafi'i school and Ahmad's companions considered it preferable. That is, asking the Prophet, may peace and blessings be upon him, to pray to Allah for forgiveness for them. Ibn Taymiyya has mentioned all of this [see: Al-Sarim Al-Munki by Ibn Abdul Hadi p. 265 and Majmu' Al-Fatawa 159/1 and 241/1]. This is also supported by references in various jurisprudential works related to the Hajj, such as Al-Mughni by Ibn Qudamah 478/3-479, Al-Sharh Al-Kabir by Abu Al-Faraj Al-Maqdisi 494/3-495, Al-Majmu' by Al-Nawawi 274/8-275, attributed to Al-Mawardi and others from the Shafi'i school. Their disagreement is an isolated incident, and no scholar is known to have stated that any of this constitutes major shirk. Sheikh Islam Muhammad bin Abdul Wahhab was the first to assert this, followed by the scholars of the Najdi da'wah [see: Al-Majmu' Al-Mufid by Sheikh Saad bin Hamad bin Atiq p. 31-32]. They were opposed by contemporaries such as Bakr Abu Zeid, Abdul Rahman Al-Barrak, Muhammad Al-Saleh Al-Othaimeen, and Abdul Aziz Al-Tarifi. When commenting on the third narration, this is not an exclusive opinion of Sheikh Islam Ibn Taymiyya, as claimed by the proponents of grave worshiping, both ancient and modern. Imam Al-Baghawi mentioned in his Tafsir quoting Al-Suddi, may Allah have mercy on him: "He is the one intended in times of desires, the one sought for help in calamities," and what is clear from the verse and Al-Suddi's interpretation is a limitation and specification to define the two pillars of the sentence.

5. Important Note: The discussion here is limited to polytheistic supplication. It is mentioned to address the issue of asking the deceased for prayers at their graves, similar to asking the living. S

ome later scholars, even among those who prohibited it, referred to it as a form of supplication. Therefore, clarification is necessary when explaining the ruling on prohibited supplication, following the approach taken by Sheikh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyya in discussing the concept of intermediation.

He stated in his notable principle, "Once this is known, it becomes clear that the terms 'intermediation' and 'seeking nearness' are general and ambiguous. It is necessary to define their meanings and give each its due right. What is mentioned in the Qur'an and Sunnah about this and its meaning must be known, along with what the Companions said and did, and the meaning of that. Also, what later scholars introduced regarding this term and its meaning should be recognized. Much of the confusion among people in this regard is due to the generality and ambiguity in expressions and meanings. Many do not distinguish well between the different aspects of this issue, so it is important to clarify the discourse" [Fatawa 1/199]. This is the reality when discussing supplication for the deceased in general and seeking help specifically. Some assert that all forms of this constitute major shirk, while others argue that none of it is major shirk. Many find it challenging to distinguish between these two opinions, which necessitates distinguishing between "supplication to other than Allah" and "asking the deceased for prayers at their graves, similar to asking the living." The former constitutes major shirk, while the latter serves as a means to it. Ibn Muflih conveyed from his teacher Ibn Taymiyya a narration about the consensus on declaring someone a disbeliever who "established intermediaries between him and Allah, relied on them, invoked them, and sought their help" [Al-Furu' 188/10, see also: 6/1]. This narration was further transmitted by Al-Mardawi in Al-Insaf, 327/10, and Al-Hajawi in Al-Iqna' and others like Kashaf Al-Qina' from the text of Al-Iqna' by Al-Hajawi, Sharh Al-Buhuti, 168/6, and refer to the explanation: 20/1. In these discussions, as the Hanbalis continued to transmit the consensus, they responded to Ibn 'Afalq's claim – in ridiculing those who adhere to the renewal of religion (page 19) – that Ibn Taymiyya was the only one to hold this opinion, and that Al-Hajawi disassociated himself from his followers by attributing it to him. Therefore, there is no valid evidence that seeking prayers from the deceased at their graves is considered major shirk. The origin of the statement is Ibn Taymiyya's assertion in Al-Wasitiyyah between the truth and creation: "Whoever makes the angels and the prophets intermediaries, invoking them, relying on them, asking them to bring benefits and repel harm, such as asking them for forgiveness of sins, guidance for hearts, relief from distress, and closing gaps, is a disbeliever by consensus of the Muslims" [Fatawa 124/1].

He further states, "And asking them to bring benefits and repel harm, such as..." explaining how they are made intermediaries by invoking them and relying on them. The question here, as evident from the examples, is a clear and explicit invocation to beings other than Allah for something only Allah can accomplish. It involves seeking polytheistic intercession that contradicts the Quran. The phrase "And asking them" is coupled with "invoking them" through the conjunction "and" as a means of connecting the two phrases and emphasizing the additional benefit, a linguistic feature termed "attaching an explanation," as noted by linguists [See what Al-Samarrai mentioned from grammarians in "Meanings of Grammar" 2003-201]. Al-Suyuti called it "the attachment of interpretation" in his commentary on verse 53 of Surah Al-Baqarah, and Ibn Ashur in Tafsir Al-Tahrir and Al-Tanwir [72/2, 197/10, and 18204/10, 173/19] mentioned it as "interpretative attachment."

6.

7. Ibn Taymiyya reinforces this concept elsewhere, stating, "As for the supplicant and the one seeking help, they are the ones who ask the invoked, seek from them, seek their help, and rely on them" [Fatawa 276/3]. He further clarifies the matter by saying, "And if he establishes them as intermediaries between Allah and His creation – like the barrier between the king and his subjects – where they elevate the needs of creation to Allah, then Allah guides His servants and provides for them through their intercession. The creation asks them, and they ask Allah, just as intermediaries with kings – they ask the kings for the needs of the people, as they are closer to the king than those seeking needs. Whoever establishes them as intermediaries in this way is a disbeliever, a polytheist, and must be asked to repent. If he repents, well and good; otherwise, he should be killed. These people liken Allah to His creation, making them similar to idols and attributing partners to Allah" [Fatawa 126/1]. His discourse explains itself, and the Buhuti in his explanation of Al-Iqna' sheds light on the narration of consensus transmitted by the Hanbalis from Ibn Taymiyya with the statement, "He disbelieved because that is like the act of idol worshippers who say, 'We only worship them to bring us closer to Allah, rank by rank'" [Al-Iqna' Sharh Al-Buhuti 200/11].

Ibn Taymiyya mentioned regarding the attributes of the Lord, the Most Majestic: "This is similar to the information about the characteristics of lordship, such as His statement, 'Indeed, I am Allah. There is no deity except Me, so worship Me,' and His saying, 'Call upon Me; I will respond to you,' and His saying, 'Whether you show what is within yourselves or conceal it, Allah will bring you to account for it,' and His saying, 'Or do those who commit evils think We will make them like those who have believed and done righteous deeds, [equal] in their life and their death?' and His saying, 'Indeed, My servants, there is no authority for you over them, and sufficient is your Lord as Disposer of affairs,' and His saying, 'Indeed, We will support Our messengers and those who believe during the life of this world and on the Day when the witnesses will stand,' and His saying, 'And whoever fears Allah – He will make for him a way out and provide for him from where he does not expect. And whoever relies upon Allah – then He is sufficient for him.' And similar to this speech, in which the Lord mentions some of His characteristics" [Fatawa 137/6-138].

He also stated: "For example, someone saying, 'All sustenance that Sheikh So-and-So does not provide for me, I do not want it.' Or saying, 'When I slaughter a sheep, I do so in the name of my master.' Or bowing down to someone in worship, invoking him or others besides Allah, saying, 'O my master, so-and-so, forgive me, have mercy on me, help me, provide for me, rescue me, reward me, I rely on you, you are sufficient for me,' or similar statements and actions that are exclusive to the lordship that only belongs to Allah – all of this is considered major shirk and apostasy, and the one committing it must be asked to repent. If he repents, well and good; otherwise, he should be killed. Indeed, Allah sent the messengers and revealed the scriptures so that we worship Allah alone, without associating any partners with Him, and we do not make any gods besides Allah" [Fatawa 395/3].

Regarding idols, he mentioned: "It is known that no one believes that they create entities and do as they please and other characteristics of lordship" [Fatawa 559/7].

He also stated: "Something nonexistent in terms of action, whether actual or potential, cannot be innovated by the human intellect without material existence. Just as his power cannot innovate anything without material existence. Indeed, innovation is among the characteristics of lordship" [Fatawa 67/6]. Describing a created being with such attributes, even in a particular aspect, even if combined with belief in divine destiny and permission for it, does not negate its categorization as major shirk, whether requested or not.

Regarding explicit disbelief (kufr al-zahir), it can occur through clear statements, unequivocal indications, or when the text implies that what a person has said with their tongue or done with their limbs constitutes major disbelief (kufr al-akbar). Since this matter is hidden and not directly observable, it has been regulated in Sharia by an outward and visible order. These are the reasons for declaring someone as a disbeliever, whether by their verbal statements or actions performed with their limbs. This is the case in apparent legal rulings, and the requirement for the belief in disbelief for such a declaration differs from the extremists among the Murji'ah.

From this stems the discussion about major polytheism (shirk al-akbar), as it is among the acts that lead to disbelief. The apparent aspect of it arises from verbal statements or actions performed with limbs. It is implied by an underlying disbelief, either related to a belief of the heart, one of the four mentioned in Surah Saba as a form of polytheism in lordship, or related to an action of the heart. Sheikh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah mentioned the types of polytheism among the Arabs, saying: "And a type is that they love them without any reason. As Allah Almighty said, 'Have you seen he who has taken as his god his [own] desire?' (Quran, 45:23). One of them loves something, so he takes it as a deity without seeking any benefit or harm from it... These people have set up rivals to Allah, as Allah said, 'And of the people is he who takes other than Allah as equals [to Him], loving them as [only] Allah should be loved. But those who believe are stronger in love for Allah' (Quran, 2:165–166). This is not known in any nation as a whole, and knowledge is with Allah" (Fatawa 5).

The presence of any of these aspects in the hidden realm, where someone appears to commit major polytheism either explicitly or through clear indications or the implication of the text that what they said or did with their limbs is major polytheism, does not necessarily require belief in polytheism in

lordship or belief in the divinity of someone other than Allah or other forms of heart-related disbelief. This is in contrast to the extremists among the Murji'ah and the leaders of grave-worshippers.

The Tabi'i Qatadah, may Allah have mercy on him, said after mentioning the reason for the revelation of the verse (Quran, 6:121), "And do not eat of that upon which the name of Allah has not been mentioned," that it signifies associating partners with Allah. He stated, "Indeed, we, by Allah, do not know it to be polytheism, except by one of three things: invoking another deity alongside Allah, prostrating to other than Allah, or slaughtering in the name of someone other than Allah," narrated by Ibn Jarir in his Tafsir.

All of this is based on the reality of faith according to Ahl al-Sunnah and the fundamental connection between the apparent and the hidden. The confusion of an apparent form of major or minor polytheism should not undermine this foundation.

Based on the two preceding introductions, the matter of asking the deceased for supplication at their grave, similar to how the living are asked, has not been supported by a clear, authentic evidence that is not contradicted. There is no clear indication that it constitutes major polytheism, nor is it necessarily linked to any form of polytheism in lordship or other disbelieving beliefs. Until proven to be either disbelief or major polytheism, it remains unsupported by strong evidence.

A notable point is that when Ibn Taymiyyah addressed this issue and discussed its motives, he limited his discussion to the belief that the deceased hears the speech addressed to them at their grave and the concept that "the Prophet, peace be upon him, or other prophets and righteous individuals supplicate and intercede for the righteous among their communities." He mentioned that this is of the same kind as "the angels supplicate for us and seek forgiveness." He asserted that what the angels, prophets, and righteous individuals do after death is by divine command, and it is a limited matter; they do what Allah has commanded them to do. It is not something beyond their capacity, unlike things that only Allah can do, which are among the unique attributes of divine actions.

Footnote:

Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy on him, said, "Acts such as prostrating to idols and insulting the Prophet, peace be upon him, and similar actions are only considered disbelief due to their implication of hidden disbelief." (Al-Fatawa 120/14). The eminent scholar Ibn al-Qayyim, may Allah have mercy on him, provided an explanation for this concept. He stated, "Say, 'Invoke those you have claimed [as gods] besides Allah. They do not possess an atom's weight [of ability] in the heavens or on the earth, nor do they have therein any partnership [with Him], nor is there for Him from among them any assistant. And intercession does not benefit with Him except for one whom He permits.' So, the polytheist takes his deity believing that he will attain benefit through it. The only source of benefit is one of these four possibilities: either the deity owns what the worshipper seeks, making the worshipper a partner with the owner; or if the deity is not an owner, then it becomes a helper and supporter; or if it is neither a helper nor a supporter, it becomes an intercessor. Allah, in this verse, negates the four levels in descending order, denying ownership, partnership, assistance, and intercession that the polytheist assumes. Instead, He affirms intercession but with His permission, excluding any share in it for the polytheist. This verse is sufficient as a clear proof, illumination, salvation, and foundation for affirming the oneness of Allah, refuting the fundamentals of polytheism and its components. (Madaarij al-Saalikeen 343/1)." Imam Shihab al-Din al-Alusi commented on polytheistic seeking of help, "I do not see anyone expressing such a belief except that he holds the belief that the invoked living or absent deceased possesses knowledge of the unseen, hears the call, and has the power independently or through others to bring good or avert harm. Otherwise, why would he invoke them and not be answered?" (Ruh al-Maani 3/298).

3 /298، وقال

الإمام السعدي رحمه الله في تفسيره لسورة سبا: "المشرك إنما يدعو ويعبد غير الله لما يرجو منه من النفع، فهذا الرجاء هو الذي أوجب له الشرك" اهـ، وقال الشيخ حافظ الحكمي رحمه الله: "وبقية المشركين يقرّون بالربوبية باطنا وظاهرا كما صرح بذلك القرآن فيما قدمنا من الآيات وغيرها، مع أن الشرك في الربوبية لازم لهم من جهة إشراكهم في الإلهية وكذا في الأسماء والصفات، إذ أنواع التوحيد متلازمة لا ينفك نوع منها عن الآخر، وهكذا أضدادها، فمن ضاد نوعا من أنواع التوحيد بشيء من الشرك فقد أشرك في الباقي، مثال ذلك في هذا الزمن عباد القبور إذا قال أحدهم يا شيخ فلان ـ لذلك المقبور ـ أغثني أو افعل لي كذا ونحو ذلك، يناديه من مسافة بعيدة وهو مع ذلك تحت التراب وقد صار ترابا، فدعاؤه إياه عبادة صرفها له من دون الله لأن الدعاء مخ العبادة، فهذا شرك في الإلهية، وسؤاله إياه تلك الحاجة من جلب خير أو دفع ضر أو رد غائب أو شفاء مريض أو نحو ذلك مما لا يقدر عليه إلا الله معتقدا أنه قادر على ذلك، هذا شرك في الربوبية حيث اعتقد أنه متصرف مع الله تعالى في ملكوته، ثم إنه لم يدعه هذا الدعاء إلا مع اعتقاده أنه يسمعه على البعد والقرب في أي وقت كان وفي أي مكان ويصرحون بذلك، وهذا شرك في الأسماء والصفات حيث أثبت له سمعا محيطا بجميع المسموعات لا يحجبه قرب ولا بعد، فاستلزم هذا الشرك في الإلهية الشرك في الربوبية والأسماء والصفات" معارج القبول 475/2 [ت:عمر بن محمود].

[9] وهؤلاء جعلوا ما هو لازم للشرك الأكبر في الظاهر ـ بعد نفيهم للتلازم وقصرهم إياه على ما كان اعتقادا قلبيا دون ما كان عملا قلبيا ـ شرطا في التكفير، طردا لأصولهم الإرجائية في باب الإيمان.

"And Imam Al-Saadi, may God have mercy on him, said in his interpretation of Surah Saba': 'The polytheist invokes and worships other than Allah for what he hopes for from it in terms of benefit, so this hope is what necessitates for him the act of associating partners with Allah.' And Sheikh Hafiz Al-Hakami, may God have mercy on him, said: 'The rest of the polytheists acknowledge [His Lordship] internally and externally, as the Quran has stated in what we have presented of the verses and others. Although polytheism in lordship is necessary for them in terms of their involvement in divinity, as well as in names and attributes, since the types of monotheism are intertwined, one type cannot be separated from the other, and likewise its opposites. So, whoever contradicts one type of monotheism with some form of polytheism has indeed associated partners with the rest. An example of this in our time is the worshippers of graves when one of them says, 'O Sheikh so-and-so,' addressing the deceased, 'help me,' or 'do such and such for me,' and similar requests. He calls out to him from a distance, while he is buried under the soil and has turned to dust. So, his supplication to him is worship directed to him besides Allah, because supplication is the essence of worship. This is polytheism in divinity, and his asking of him for those needs, whether it be seeking good, warding off harm, repelling a calamity, healing the sick, or similar matters that only Allah can accomplish, believing that He is capable of that. This is polytheism in lordship, where he believed that he has a share in the dominion of the Most High. Moreover, he did not make this supplication to him except with the belief that he hears it, whether it be from afar or near, at any time and in any place, and they openly declare this. This is polytheism in names and attributes, where they affirmed for him hearing encompassing all that is heard, not obstructed by proximity or distance. Thus, this polytheism in divinity necessitates polytheism in lordship, names, and attributes.' (Ma'arig Al-Qubul 475/2 [by 'Umar bin Mahmoud]). And these individuals have considered what is necessary for major polytheism in appearance - after their denial of interrelation and their shortening it to what was a heartfelt belief rather than an action - as a condition for excommunication, expelling their fundamentalist roots in the realm of faith."

ونبه ابن تيمية على أنه حتى "وإن كان الله وكّلهم بأعمال يعملونها"، "فَلَيْسَ لَنَا أَنْ نَطْلُبَ ذَلِكَ مِنْهُمْ"، حيث "لَا يُؤَثِّرُ فِيهِ سُؤَالُ السَّائِلِينَ"، إذ "ليس في سؤالهم إياه منفعة، بل مضرة، فنهى عنه لأنه شر لا خير فيه"، "لِأَنَّ ذَلِكَ ذَرِيعَةٌ إلَى الشِّرْكِ بِهِمْ وَعِبَادَتِهِمْ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى" [10].

وهذا بخلاف ما يذكره ابن تيمية من دوافع لشرك العبادة ودعاء غير الله فيما لا يقدر عليه إلا الله، حيث يذكر قوله سبحانه {قُلِ ادْعُوا الَّذِينَ زَعَمْتُم مِّن دُونِ اللَّهِ ۖ لَا يَمْلِكُونَ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَمَا لَهُمْ فِيهِمَا مِن شِرْكٍ وَمَا لَهُ مِنْهُم مِّن ظَهِيرٍ * وَلَا تَنفَعُ الشَّفَاعَةُ عِندَهُ إِلَّا لِمَنْ أَذِنَ لَهُ} [11]، وقوله {قُلِ ادْعُوا الَّذِينَ زَعَمْتُم مِّن دُونِهِ فَلَا يَمْلِكُونَ كَشْفَ الضُّرِّ عَنكُمْ وَلَا تَحْوِيلًا}، ونحوهما من الآيات، كما هو معلوم من عدة مواطن من كتاباته [12]، فدلّ هذا على تفريقه بين الأمرين.

كما يدل على الفرق بينهما، أن الدوافعَ التي ذكرها لـ(سؤال الميت الدعاء عند قبره كما يسأل الحي) دائرةٌ بين أمر واقع وبين أمر ممكن الوقوع لوقوع ما هو من جنسه، واعتقاد وجود ذلك ليس بشرك، بينما جميع دوافع شرك العبادة ـ ومنها دعاء غير الله فيما لا يقدر عليه إلا هو سبحانه ـ اعتقادات شركية في الربوبية، وعليه فلا وجود لشيء منها في الخارج لاستحالتها، فكيف يستويان؟!!

وما سبق تقريره يستقيم مع ما اتفق عليه أهل السنة من تعريف دعاء غير الله بطلب غيره ما لا يقدر عليه إلا هو سبحانه، وذلك أن (سؤال الميت الدعاء عند قبره كما يُسأل الحي) لا ينطبق عليه هذا التعريف، إذ (سؤال الدعاء) ليس هو مما لا يقدر عليه إلا الله من خصائص أفعاله سبحانه.

Ibn Taymiyyah cautioned that even if Allah and others were to perform actions, it is not permissible to seek those actions from them, as the question of the questioners is not considered in it. There is no preference for it in the question of the questioners, as their question does not bring any benefit but rather harm. Therefore, it is prohibited because it is an avenue to associating partners with them and worshipping them besides Allah the Almighty. This is contrary to what Ibn Taymiyyah mentions regarding the motives for the polytheism of worship and supplicating to other than Allah for what only Allah can do. He mentions Allah's saying: "Say, 'Invoke those you have claimed [as gods] besides Allah.' They do not possess an atom's weight in the heavens or on the earth, and they do not have therein any partnership [with Him], nor is there for Him from among them any assistant." (Quran 34:22-23). And His saying: "Say, 'Invoke those you have claimed [as gods] besides Him, for they do not possess the [ability for] removal of adversity from you or [for its] transfer.'" (Quran 17:56). These verses and similar ones are well known from several instances in his writings. This indicates his differentiation between the two matters.

Furthermore, it signifies the distinction between them, as the motives he mentioned for (asking the deceased for supplication at his grave as the living ask) are encompassed between an actual occurrence and a possible occurrence due to the occurrence of something of its kind. Believing in the existence of that is not polytheism. Whereas, all the motives for polytheism of worship - including supplicating to other than Allah for what only He can do - are polytheistic beliefs in lordship. Thus, none of them exist externally due to their impossibility. How then can they be equal?!

What was previously determined aligns with the consensus of the people of Sunnah regarding the definition of supplicating to other than Allah by seeking something only He can do. This is because (asking the deceased for supplication at his grave as the living ask) does not fit this definition, as (the request for supplication) is not among the unique characteristics of His actions.

ومن صور (سؤال الميت الدعاء عند قبره كما يُسأل الحي): طلب الشفاعة للآخرة من الميت عند قبره كما تطلب من الحي، وحكمه حكمها، ويجري عليه نفس التفصيل السابق.

وبيان وجه ذلك بشيء من الإيجاز أن (طلب الشفاعة للآخرة من الميت عند قبره كما تطلب من الحي) غير مستلزم لشيء من شرك الربوبية أو غير ذلك من المعتقدات الكفرية، ويشهد لهذا قول ابن تيمية ـ الذي ورد فيه تعرض لدوافعها ـ:

And among the forms of this (asking the deceased for supplication at his grave as one asks the living, seeking intercession for the Hereafter from the deceased at his grave as you seek from the living, with its ruling being the same, and the same previous elaboration applies to it.

Explaining the reason for that briefly, (seeking intercession for the Hereafter from the deceased at his grave as you seek from the living) does not entail any form of polytheism in lordship or other beliefs of disbelief, and testimony to this is the statement of Ibn Taymiyyah - who mentioned its motives -:

"بِخِلَافِ مَا يُطْلَبُ مِنْ أَحَدِهِمْ فِي حَيَاتِهِ مِنْ **الدُّعَاءِ وَالشَّفَاعَةِ** فَإِنَّهُ لَا يُفْضِي إلَى ذَلِكَ؛ فَإِنَّ أَحَدًا مِنْ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ وَالصَّالِحِينَ لَمْ يُعْبَدْ فِي حَيَاتِهِ بِحَضْرَتِهِ فَإِنَّهُ يَنْهَى مَنْ يَفْعَلُ ذَلِكَ.... وَالْمَيِّتَ لَا يَنْهَى مَنْ يُشْرِكُ بَلْ إذَا تَعَلَّقَتْ الْقُلُوبُ **بِدُعَائِهِ وَشَفَاعَتِهِ** أَفْضَى ذَلِكَ إلَى الشِّرْكِ بِهِ"، إلى أن قال: "فَالْمَلَائِكَةُ يَسْتَغْفِرُونَ لِلْمُؤْمِنِينَ مِنْ غَيْرِ أَنْ يَسْأَلَهُمْ أَحَدٌ. وَكَذَلِكَ مَا رُوِيَ أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَوْ غَيْرَهُ مِنْ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ وَالصَّالِحِينَ **يَدْعُو وَيَشْفَعُ** لِلْأَخْيَارِ مِنْ أُمَّتِهِ هُوَ مِنْ هَذَا الْجِنْسِ، هُمْ يَفْعَلُونَ مَا أَذِنَ اللَّهُ لَهُمْ فِيهِ بِدُونِ سُؤَالِ أَحَدٍ. وَإِذَا لَمْ يُشْرَعْ دُعَاءُ الْمَلَائِكَةِ لَمْ يُشْرَعْ دُعَاءُ مَنْ مَاتَ مِنْ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ وَالصَّالِحِينَ، وَلَا أَنْ نَطْلُبَ مِنْهُمْ **الدُّعَاءَ وَالشَّفَاعَةَ**، وَإِنْ كَانُوا **يَدْعُونَ وَيَشْفَعُونَ**، لِوَجْهَيْنِ: أَحَدُهُمَا: أَنَّ مَا أَمَرَهُمْ اللَّهُ بِهِ مِنْ ذَلِكَ هُمْ يَفْعَلُونَهُ وَإِنْ لَمْ يُطْلَبْ مِنْهُمْ.... الثَّانِي: أَنَّ **دُعَاءَهُمْ وَطَلَبَ الشَّفَاعَةِ مِنْهُمْ** فِي هَذِهِ الْحَالِ يُفْضِي إلَى الشِّرْكِ بِهِمْ..." الفتاوى 179/1-180.

"Contrary to what is sought from someone during his lifetime in terms of supplication and intercession, it does not lead to that. If any of the prophets and righteous people had been present during his lifetime, he would have prevented anyone from doing that. And the deceased does not prevent anyone from committing shirk. Rather, when the hearts become attached to his supplication and intercession, it leads to associating partners with Allah. Until he said: "So the angels seek forgiveness for the believers without being asked by anyone. Similarly, it has been narrated that the Prophet, peace and blessings be upon him, or others among the prophets and righteous people, pray and intercede for the righteous from his nation, it is of this kind. They do what Allah has permitted them in this regard without being asked by anyone. And if the angels' supplication is not legislated, then the supplication of those who die among the prophets and righteous people is not legislated, nor is it permissible to ask them for supplication and intercession, even if they are invoked and intercede. For two reasons: One of them is that whatever Allah has commanded them to do, they do it even if they are not asked. The second is that their supplication and the request for intercession from them in this situation lead to associating partners with them." - Fatawa 179/1-180.

Footnote:

[10] قال ابن تيمية في قاعدة جليلة في التوسل والوسيلة: "وَمَعْلُومٌ أَنَّ الْمَلَائِكَةَ تَدْعُوا لِلْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَتَسْتَغْفِرُ لَهُمْ كَمَا قَالَ تَعَالَى {الَّذِينَ يَحْمِلُونَ الْعَرْشَ وَمَنْ حَوْلَهُ يُسَبِّحُونَ بِحَمْدِ رَبِّهِمْ وَيُؤْمِنُونَ بِهِ وَيَسْتَغْفِرُونَ لِلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا رَبَّنَا وَسِعْتَ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ رَحْمَةً وَعِلْمًا فَاغْفِرْ لِلَّذِينَ تَابُوا وَاتَّبَعُوا سَبِيلَكَ وَقِهِمْ عَذَابَ الْجَحِيمِ * رَبَّنَا وَأَدْخِلْهُمْ جَنَّاتِ عَدْنٍ الَّتِي وَعَدْتَهُمْ وَمَنْ صَلَحَ مِنْ آبَائِهِمْ وَأَزْوَاجِهِمْ وَذُرِّيَّاتِهِمْ إنَّكَ أَنْتَ الْعَزِيزُ الْحَكِيمُ * وَقِهِمُ السَّيِّئَاتِ وَمَنْ تَقِ السَّيِّئَاتِ يَوْمَئِذٍ فَقَدْ رَحِمْتَهُ وَذَلِكَ هُوَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ}، وَقَالَ تَعَالَى {تَكَادُ السَّمَاوَاتُ يَتَفَطَّرْنَ مِنْ فَوْقِهِنَّ وَالْمَلَائِكَةُ يُسَبِّحُونَ بِحَمْدِ رَبِّهِمْ وَيَسْتَغْفِرُونَ لِمَنْ فِي الْأَرْضِ أَلَا إنَّ اللَّهَ هُوَ الْغَفُورُ الرَّحِيمُ * وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مِنْ دُونِهِ أَوْلِيَاءَ اللَّهُ حَفِيظٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَمَا أَنْتَ عَلَيْهِمْ بِوَكِيلٍ}. فَالْمَلَائِكَةُ يَسْتَغْفِرُونَ لِلْمُؤْمِنِينَ مِنْ غَيْرِ أَنْ يَسْأَلَهُمْ أَحَدٌ. وَكَذَلِكَ مَا رُوِيَ أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَوْ غَيْرَهُ مِنْ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ وَالصَّالِحِينَ يَدْعُو وَيَشْفَعُ لِلْأَخْيَارِ مِنْ أُمَّتِهِ هُوَ مِنْ هَذَا الْجِنْسِ، هُمْ يَفْعَلُونَ مَا أَذِنَ اللَّهُ لَهُمْ فِيهِ بِدُونِ سُؤَالِ أَحَدٍ. وَإِذَا لَمْ يُشْرَعْ دُعَاءُ الْمَلَائِكَةِ لَمْ يُشْرَعْ دُعَاءُ مَنْ مَاتَ مِنْ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ وَالصَّالِحِينَ وَلَا أَنْ نَطْلُبَ مِنْهُمْ الدُّعَاءَ وَالشَّفَاعَةَ، وَإِنْ كَانُوا يَدْعُونَ وَيَشْفَعُونَ لِوَجْهَيْنِ: أَحَدُهُمَا: أَنَّ مَا أَمَرَهُمْ اللَّهُ بِهِ مِنْ ذَلِكَ هُمْ يَفْعَلُونَهُ وَإِنْ لَمْ يُطْلَبْ مِنْهُمْ، وَمَا لَمْ يُؤْمَرُوا بِهِ لَا يَفْعَلُونَهُ وَلَوْ طُلِبَ مِنْهُمْ، فَلَا فَائِدَةَ فِي الطَّلَبِ مِنْهُمْ. الثَّانِي: أَنَّ دُعَاءَهُمْ وَطَلَبَ الشَّفَاعَةِ مِنْهُمْ فِي هَذِهِ الْحَالِ يُفْضِي إلَى الشِّرْكِ بِهِمْ فَفِيهِ هَذِهِ الْمَفْسَدَةُ فَلَوْ قُدِّرَ أَنَّ فِيهِ مَصْلَحَةً لَكَانَتْ هَذِهِ الْمَفْسَدَةُ رَاجِحَةً فَكَيْفَ وَلَا مَصْلَحَةَ فِيهِ؛ بِخِلَافِ الطَّلَبِ مِنْهُمْ فِي حَيَاتِهِمْ وَحُضُورِهِمْ فَإِنَّهُ لَا مَفْسَدَةَ فِيهِ؛ فَإِنَّهُمْ يَنْهَوْنَ عَنْ الشِّرْكِ بِهِمْ. بَلْ فِيهِ مَنْفَعَةٌ وَهُوَ أَنَّهُمْ يُثَابُونَ وَيُؤْجَرُونَ عَلَى مَا يَفْعَلُونَهُ حِينَئِذٍ مِنْ نَفْعِ الْخَلْقِ كُلِّهِمْ فَإِنَّهُمْ فِي دَارِ الْعَمَلِ وَالتَّكْلِيفِ وَشَفَاعَتُهُمْ فِي الْآخِرَةِ فِيهَا إظْهَارُ كَرَامَةِ اللَّهِ لَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ" الفتاوى 179/1-181، وقال أيضا في نفس المصدر: "فَنَهَى سُبْحَانَهُ عَنْ دُعَاءِ الْمَلَائِكَةِ وَالْأَنْبِيَاءِ مَعَ إخْبَارِهِ لَنَا أَنَّ الْمَلَائِكَةَ يَدْعُونَ لَنَا وَيَسْتَغْفِرُونَ مَعَ هَذَا فَلَيْسَ لَنَا أَنْ نَطْلُبَ ذَلِكَ مِنْهُمْ. وَكَذَلِكَ الْأَنْبِيَاءُ وَالصَّالِحُونَ وَإِنْ كَانُوا أَحْيَاءً فِي قُبُورِهِمْ، وَإِنْ قُدِّرَ أَنَّهُمْ يَدْعُونَ لِلْأَحْيَاءِ، وَإِنْ وَرَدَتْ بِهِ آثَارٌ، فَلَيْسَ لِأَحَدِ أَنْ يَطْلُبَ مِنْهُمْ ذَلِكَ وَلَمْ يَفْعَلْ ذَلِكَ أَحَدٌ مِنْ السَّلَفِ لِأَنَّ ذَلِكَ ذَرِيعَةٌ إلَى الشِّرْكِ بِهِمْ وَعِبَادَتِهِمْ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى؛ بِخِلَافِ الطَّلَبِ مِنْ أَحَدِهِمْ فِي حَيَاتِهِ فَإِنَّهُ لَا يُفْضِي إلَى الشِّرْكِ؛ وَلِأَنَّ مَا تَفْعَلُهُ الْمَلَائِكَةُ وَيَفْعَلُهُ الْأَنْبِيَاءُ وَالصَّالِحُونَ بَعْدَ الْمَوْتِ هُوَ بِالْأَمْرِ الْكَوْنِيِّ فَلَا يُؤَثِّرُ فِيهِ سُؤَالُ السَّائِلِينَ بِخِلَافِ سُؤَالِ أَحَدِهِمْ فِي حَيَاتِهِ فَإِنَّهُ يُشْرَعُ إجَابَةُ السَّائِلِ وَبَعْدَ الْمَوْتِ انْقَطَعَ التَّكْلِيفُ عَنْهُمْ" الفتاوى 330/1-331. وقال في الرد على البكري: "فما تفعله الملائكة والأنبياء بعد الموت هو أمر محدود، يفعلون منه ما أمر الله به، لا يزداد بسؤال السائلين، فليس في سؤالهم إياه منفعة، بل مضرة، فنهى عنه لأنه شر لا خير فيه، فصار بمنزلة أن يطلب الرجل من الشمس أن تصحبه ومن الريح أن تهب ونحو ذلك. وكذلك كل ما يؤمر بأمر تكوين لا يحتاج أن يطلب، فإنه فاعله، طلب أو لم يطلب، وما لم يأذن به الله فهو لا يفعله، طلب منه أو لم يطلب، بخلاف الشفاعة يوم القيامة، فإن الناس يسألونه، وسؤال الحي الحاضر يجوز في الدنيا والقيامة، وإن كان الميت يسمع الكلام كما ثبت في الصحيح عن النبي ﷺ أنه قال في أهل القليب: "ما أنتم بأسمع لما أقول منهم". وثبت عنه ﷺ أنه قال: إن الميت ليسمع قرع نعالهم حين يتولون عنه مدبرين". وقال ﷺ: "ما من رجل يمر بقبر الرجل كان يعرفه في الدنيا، فيسلم عليه، إلا رد الله عليه روحه حتى يرد عليه السلام" رواه أبو عمر بن عبر البر وصححه" خلاصة الاستغاثة 245/1-247، وقال أيضا في نفس المصدر: "حتى إذا قُدر أن الله يكلفهم بأعمال يعملونها بعد الموت؛ لم يلزم من ذلك جواز دعائهم، كما لا يجوز دعاء الملائكة؛ وإن كان الله وكلهم بأعمال يعملونها، لما في ذلك من الشرك والذريعة إلى الشرك" ص256-257 [ت:السهلي] وخلاصة الاستغاثة 498/1-499.

[11] قال ابن تيمية: "فَهَذِهِ الْأَرْبَعَةُ هِيَ الَّتِي يُمْكِنُ أَنْ يَكُونَ لَهُمْ بِهَا تَعَلُّقٌ. الْأَوَّلُ: مِلْكُ شَيْءٍ وَلَوْ قَلَّ الثَّانِي: شِرْكُهُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ مِنْ الْمِلْكِ. فَلَا مِلْكَ وَلَا شَرِكَةَ وَلَا مُعَاوَنَةَ يَصِيرُ بِهَا نِدًّا. فَإِذَا انْتَفَتْ الثَّلَاثَةُ: بَقِيَتْ الشَّفَاعَةُ فَعَلَّقَهَا بِالْمَشِيئَةِ" مجموع الفتاوى 114/1.

[12] انظر على سبيل المثال: مجموع الفتاوى 114/1-115 و123-124 و178-179، و5/3-6، و279/27-280.

Ibn Taymiyyah said in a noble principle regarding seeking intercession and means: "It is known that the angels supplicate for the believers and seek forgiveness for them, as Allah says: 'Those [angels] who carry the Throne and those around it exalt [Allah] with praise of their Lord and believe in Him and ask forgiveness for those who have believed, [saying], "Our Lord, You have encompassed all

things in mercy and knowledge, so forgive those who have repented and followed Your way and protect them from the punishment of Hellfire. Our Lord, and admit them to gardens of perpetual residence which You have promised them and whoever was righteous among their fathers, their spouses and their offspring. Indeed, it is You who is the Exalted in Might, the Wise. And protect them from the evil consequences [of their deeds]. And he whom You protect from evil consequences that Day - You will have given him mercy. And that is the great attainment.' (Quran 40:7-9) And Allah says: 'The heavens almost break from above them, and the angels exalt [Allah] with praise of their Lord and ask forgiveness for those on earth. Unquestionably, it is Allah who is the Forgiving, the Merciful.'" "And those they invoke other than Him are not [able to] aid them, but they are [themselves] soldiers [who are ordered] to be present for protection. And the angels glorify [Allah] with praise of their Lord and ask forgiveness for those on earth. Unquestionably, it is Allah who is the Forgiving, the Merciful. And similarly, it has been narrated that the Prophet (peace be upon him), or others among the prophets and righteous, supplicate and intercede for the righteous among their nations, and this is of the same kind. They do what Allah has allowed them to do without anyone's request. And if the supplication of the angels is not specified, then the supplication of the deceased prophets and righteous is not specified either, nor should we seek supplication and intercession from them, even though they are invoked and intercede for two purposes: one is..." "They do what Allah has commanded them to do of that without being asked, and what they have not been commanded, they do not do even if they are asked. So, there is no benefit in seeking from them. Secondly: Their supplication and seeking intercession from them in this state leads to associating partners with them, so there is this harm. If there were any benefit in it, this harm would outweigh it. But since there is no benefit in it, unlike seeking from them during their lifetime and presence, as there is no harm in that, as they forbid associating partners with them. Rather, there is benefit in it, as they are rewarded and recompensed for what they do at that time, benefiting all creatures. For they are in the realm of action and responsibility, and their intercession in the Hereafter is a manifestation of Allah's honor for them on the Day of Judgment." - Fatwas, 1791-181
He also said in the same source: "Therefore, He, Exalted be He, has forbidden seeking the supplication of angels and prophets, even though He has informed us that angels supplicate and seek forgiveness for us. Despite this, it is not for us to seek that from them. Similarly, for the prophets and the righteous, even if they are alive in their graves, even if it were determined that they supplicate for the living, and even if there were reports about it, no one from the predecessors ever did so because that would be a means to associating partners with them and worshiping them besides Allah. This is contrary to seeking from them during their lifetime because that does not lead to associating partners [with Allah], and because what the angels do, and what the prophets and the righteous do after death is by divine command, so the request of the petitioners does not influence it, unlike seeking from them during their lifetime, where answering the petitioner is allowed. After death, they are absolved from responsibility." - Fatwas 330/1-331
He also said in response to Al-Bukhari: "What the angels and prophets do after death is a limited matter. They do only what Allah has commanded, and their actions are not increased by the requests of petitioners. There is no benefit in their requests; rather, it is harmful. Thus, it is like a person asking the sun to accompany him or the wind to blow, and similar requests. Likewise, anything that is commanded by a decree of creation does not need to be requested, for it occurs regardless of whether it is sought or not, and whatever Allah has not permitted is not done, whether it is requested or not, unlike intercession on the Day of Judgment, where people ask for it. Asking the living present is permissible in both the worldly life and the Hereafter. Even though the deceased hears the speech, as it is authentically reported from the Prophet, peace and blessings be upon him, that he said about the people of the graves: "You are not heard better than they." It is also established from him, peace and blessings be upon him, that he said: "Indeed, the deceased hears the sound of their sandals when they turn away from him." And he said: "Whenever a man passes by the grave of a man whom he knew in the world and greets him, Allah returns his soul to him until he returns his greeting." - Al-Istighatha 245/1-247

He also said in the same source: "So when it is decreed that Allah will assign them tasks to perform after death, this does not imply the permissibility of supplicating to them, just as it is not permissible to supplicate to the angels. Even though Allah has assigned them tasks to perform, supplicating to them is prohibited because it leads to associating partners with Allah and is a means to it." - Page 256-257, Sahli's edition and Al-Istighatha, summary 498/1-499.

Ibn Taymiyyah said: "These four are the ones with which there may be a connection. The first: owning something, even if it is little. The second: their association in owning something. Thus, neither ownership, nor partnership, nor assistance becomes an obligation. So if the first three are eliminated, intercession remains, and it is linked to the will." - Majmu' al-Fatawa 114/1. See, for example, Majmu' al-Fatawa 114/1-115, 123-124, 178-179, and 5/3-6, and 279/27-280.

وتأمل كيف أن ابن تيمية سوى بين (طلب الشفاعة) و(طلب الدعاء) من عدة وجوه، منها ما هو متعلق بالأحكام، ومنها ما هو متعلق بالأخبار، وأجرى عليهما نفس التفصيل في جميع ما ذكره، وجعل طلبهما من الميت عند قبره مفضيا إلى الشرك به لا شركا أكبر. وكيف لا يكون الأمر كذلك، و(طلب الشفاعة للآخرة من الميت عند قبره) لا يندرج تحت صريح دعاء غير الله جل وعلا، إذ ليس فيه سؤال ما لا يقدر عليه إلا الله، فكون الملائكة والأنبياء والصالحين يدعون ويشفعون، دليل على أن هذا لا تعلق له بخصائص أفعال الرب سبحانه.

ولو كان التوجه إلى الميت بطلب الشفاعة للآخرة عند قبره شركا أكبر، لكونه عبادة صُرفت لغير الله، لَلَزم أن يكون حكمها كذلك إذا تُوُجّه بهذا الطلب إلى الحي على نفس المعنى، للزوم طرد مناط الشرك الأكبر في الأحياء، كما سبق بيانه.

فإن قال قائل: وهل ثبت أصلا لأناس من الأنبياء والصالحين جواز طلب الشفاعة منهم للآخرة في حياتهم الدنيوية؟

فجوابه: أن هذه مسألة غريبة على أكثر طلبة العلم لقلة من يذكرها، وقد ورد في إثبات جوازه أحاديث وآثار:

فأما المرفوع فقد قال عدد من الصحابة لرسول الله ﷺ : "نذكرك الله والصحبة إلا جعلتنا من أهل شفاعتك"، وأجابهم النبي ﷺ بما يفيد مشروعية سؤالهم رواه أحمد في مسنده [رقم:23977] وغيره وصححه ابن أبي عاصم وابن خزيمة وابن حبان[13].

Reflect on how Ibn Taymiyyah differentiated between seeking intercession and seeking supplication from several perspectives, some of which are related to rulings and others related to reports, and he provided the same detailed analysis for all that he mentioned. He made their request from the deceased at their grave lead to associating partners with Allah, not major polytheism. And why wouldn't it be so when seeking intercession for the Hereafter from the deceased at their grave does not fall under the explicit supplication to anyone other than Allah, since it does not involve asking for something only Allah can do. The fact that angels, prophets, and the righteous pray and intercede indicates that this does not relate to the unique attributes of Allah's actions.

If seeking intercession from the deceased for the Hereafter at their grave were considered major polytheism, as it would be worship directed to other than Allah, then its ruling should be the same when directing such a request to the living, necessitating the expulsion of major polytheism from the living, as previously explained.

If someone asks: Has it been established as a principle for some people from the prophets and the righteous that it is permissible to seek intercession from them for the Hereafter in their worldly life?

The answer is: This is a strange issue for most scholars because it is rarely mentioned, yet there are narrations and evidence affirming its permissibility. As for the narrated evidence, several companions said to the Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him: "We remember Allah and keep you company; we hope to be among those for whom you intercede." The Prophet responded in a way that implies the legitimacy of their request. This is narrated by Ahmad in his Musnad [No. 23977] and others, and it was authenticated by Ibn Abi 'Asim, Ibn Khuzaymah, and Ibn Hibban.

وروى الآجري في الشريعة عن كعب الأحبار أخذ يد عباس رضي الله عنه فقال: إني أدخر هذا للشفاعة. فقال: وهل شفاعة إلا للأنبياء؟ أو قال: وهل لي شفاعة؟ قال: "نعم، ليس من أهل بيت نبي إلا كانت له شفاعة".
وروى الإمام أحمد بن حنبل في الزهد عن شعبة بن زياد قال: "رأيت عمر بن عبد العزيز آخذا بعينة من عنك عبد الله بن حسن فغمزها وقال: إني لأرجو الشفاعة بها يوم القيامة" [14].

وإخراج كل من ابن خزيمة في التوحيد وابن أبي عاصم في السنة والآجري في الشريعة وابن منده في الإيمان لهذه الروايات ونحوها من مرفوع أو موقوف في كتب الاعتقاد في باب الشفاعة، يدل على استقامة المتن وأنه ليس فيه ما يستنكر، وأن ذلك ليس من الشرك الأكبر في شيء، ولو كان كذلك لما أوردوها في مصنفاتهم العقدية، فتنبه لهذا المعنى.

ولكن يحمل مراد من سألوها في الأخبار الواردة على ما هو معلوم عندهم من صريح القرآن، أي على كونهم معتقدين أن كل ذلك معلق بشروط، وهي إذن الله ورضاه عن الشفيع والمشفوع فيه، كما روى مسلم في صحيحه [رقم:29] عَنْ الصُّنَابِحِيِّ، عَنْ عُبَادَةَ بْنِ الصَّامِتِ، أَنَّهُ قَالَ [أي الصنابحي]: " دَخَلْتُ عَلَيْهِ وَهُوَ فِي الْمَوْتِ، فَبَكَيْتُ، فَقَالَ [أي عبادة]: مَهْلًا، لِمَ تَبْكِي؟ فَوَاللهِ لَئِنْ اسْتُشْهِدْتُ لَأَشْهَدَنَّ لَكَ، وَلَئِنْ شُفِّعْتُ لَأَشْفَعَنَّ لَكَ، وَلَئِنْ اسْتَطَعْتُ لَأَنْفَعَنَّكَ..."، وما كان كذلك فلا يرد عليه أنه مما لا يقدر عليه إلا الله، كما لا يرد ذلك على سؤال الأنبياء في المحشر الشفاعة لبدء الحساب.

Al-Ajurri narrated in Ash-Shari'ah from Ka'b al-Ahbar that Abbas (may Allah be pleased with him) took the hand of Abbas and said: "I am saving this for intercession." So, Abbas asked: "Is intercession exclusive to the prophets? Or he said: Do I have intercession?" Ka'b replied: "Yes, there is not a member of the Prophet's family except that they have intercession.

Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal narrated in Az-Zuhd from Shu'bah ibn Ziyad who said: "I saw Umar ibn Abdul Aziz taking an eyeliner from Anak Abdullah ibn Hasan, he winked and said, 'I hope for intercession with this on the Day of Judgment.'"

These narrations are cited by Ibn Khuzaymah in At-Tawhid, Ibn Abi Asim in As-Sunnah, Al-Ajurri in Ash-Shari'ah, and Ibn Mundhir in Al-Iman. These reports, whether they are narrated directly from the Prophet (peace be upon him) or attributed to others, in the chapters of creed regarding intercession, indicate the correctness of their content and that there is nothing objectionable in them. If it were major polytheism, they would not have included them in their creedal works. Therefore, pay attention to this meaning.

However, the intent of those who questioned these reports in the narrations is based on what is known to them from the explicit verses of the Quran, that is, they believe that all of this is conditional upon Allah's permission and His satisfaction with the intercessor and the one for whom intercession is made. As reported by Muslim in his Sahih [No. 29] from As-Sunnabahi, from Ubada ibn As-Samit, he said: "I entered upon him while he was dying, and I cried. He said, 'Wait, why are you crying? By Allah, if I were to be martyred, I would bear witness for you, and if I were to intercede, I would intercede for you, and if I were able, I would benefit you...'". And if it were not so, it would not be argued that this is something only Allah can do, just as it would not be argued against the questioning of the prophets about intercession on the Day of Resurrection to commence the reckoning.

Footnote:

Correction:
Ibn Abi Asim and Ibn Khuzaymah's authentication of the Hadith is taken from their compilations on Hadith in the books of Sunnah and Tawhid. They have stipulated the authenticity for this purpose. Imam Adh-Dhahabi (may Allah have mercy on him) has reported this from Imam Ibn Abi Asim (may Allah have mercy on him) in his books "Al-ʻIlal" p. 197 and "Siyar Aʻlām An-Nubalā'" 14/298. Imam Ibn Khuzaymah (may Allah have mercy on him) mentioned that he stipulated this in his book on Tawhid, in its introduction. As for Imam Ibn Hibban (may Allah have mercy on him), he included the Hadith in his Sahih.

For those who wish to verify the verification of the raised Hadith and the suspended narrations and others in this chapter, and to examine their chains of narration and the various versions, they should refer to the book: "Al-Qalam Al-Maslul ʻAlā Mukaffir Sahābat Ar-Rasūl wa Bayān Al-Waqāhah fī Takfīr Min Talaba Min Al-Hayy Ash-Shafāʻah Li Ibn As-Sabbāk" (pages 23-33), which is useful in this regard. I

have benefited greatly from it: [link](https://archive.org/details/RaddHazimi/mode/2up). I have also benefited from a fatwa on the website of Saleh Al-Munajjid:
[link](https://islamqa.info/ar/answers/295308/%D8%AD%D9%83%D9%85-%D8%B7%D9%84%D8%A8-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B4%D9%81%D8%A7%D8%B9%D8%A9-%D9%85%D9%86-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B4%D9%87%D9%8A%D8%AF-%D8%A8%D8%A7%D9%86-%D9%8A%D9%82%D9%88%D9%84-%D8%A7%D9%86-%D8%A7%D8%B3%D8%AA%D8%B4%D9%87%D8%AF%D8%AA-%D9%88%D8%B4%D9%81%D8%B9%D9%83-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%84%D9%87-%D9%81%D8%A7%D8%B4%D9%81%D8%B9-%D9%84%D9%8A).

Therefore, if we were to say that seeking intercession for the Hereafter from the deceased at their grave constitutes major shirk, but then refrain from rejecting this ruling for seeking intercession for the Hereafter from the living, despite both requests being essentially the same in meaning and purpose, and the motive behind both being the same, it indicates the inconsistency of that ruling.

Therefore, seeking intercession for the Hereafter from the deceased at their grave does not amount to major shirk unless it meets one of the two conditions mentioned in the issue of invoking the deceased for supplication – which is a subset of intercession: believing that the deceased possesses divine attributes and believing in intercession that contradicts the Quran. Both of these beliefs are major shirk in themselves, whether the supplication is made to the deceased or not.

Thus, it becomes evident to us that seeking intercession for the Hereafter from the deceased at their grave, similar to seeking it from the living, does not necessitate belief in intercession that contradicts the Quran. It does not imply that one believes the intercessor has a direct influence over Allah that warrants seeking their intercession out of desire or fear. However, if this request is accompanied by such beliefs, it becomes major shirk. If it lacks such beliefs and is made with the understanding that the supplication is more likely to be accepted and that all intercession ultimately returns to Allah and can only occur with His permission and approval, then its ruling becomes lesser shirk. These are significant distinctions.

فلهذا لا يكون (طلب الشفاعة للآخرة من الميت) شركا أكبر إلا بأحد الشرطين المذكورين في مسألة (سؤال الميت الدعاء) - إذ هو فرع عنها -: الاعتقاد في الميت ما هو شرك في الصفات واعتقاد الشفاعة الشركية المنفية في القرآن، وهذان الاعتقادان شركان أكبران بذاتهما، طُلب من الميت أو لم يُطلب.

وبهذا يتبين لنا أن (طلب الشفاعة لأجل الآخرة من الميت عند قبره كما تطلب من الحي) لا يستلزم اعتقاد الشفاعة المنفية في القرآن، إذ لا يستلزم أن يعتقد في الشفيع أن له دالّة على الله لا يُردّ له بها طلب رغبة ورهبة، وأما إذا طلبت مصحوبة بهذا الاعتقاد صارت شركا أكبر، وأما إن خلت من ذلك وكانت على معنى أن دعاءه أرجى للقبول وقد يرد، وأن مرجع الشفاعة كله إلى الله ولا تكون إلا من بعد إذنه ورضاه، كان حكمها شركا أصغر، وهذه فروق مؤثرة.

فهذه الشفاعة شفاعة بدعية مفضية إلى الشرك عموما وإلى الشفاعة الشركية خصوصا، وتندرج تحت الوساطة البدعية التي ذكرها الشيخ بكر أبو زيد.

بخلاف دعاء غير الله فيما لا يقدر عليه إلا الله كسؤال غير الله أن يرزق الولد، فهذا شرك أكبر بذاته، ولا يشترط الاعتقاد الشركي للحكم عليه بكونه كفرا أكبر، فتنبه للفروق.

وليت الكاتب وقف خطأه عند حدّ الاحتجاج بما هو خارج عن محل النزاع من أقوال ابن تيمية، بل زاد على ذلك أن تكلف في حمل أقوال لابن تيمية على ما يوافق رأيه، والاحتجاج بأخرى مما هي من مجمل كلامه، مع التوسع في دعوى أن دلالة ما ينقله صريح على المطلوب.

كما أوهم القارئ أن المخالفين بين مغمور ومبتدع، وأنه لا حجة لهم من كلام ابن تيمية غير حجة واحدة متشابهة، ولم يقف على حججهم الكثيرة والمتنوعة، فضلا عن أن يجيب عنها[15]، وهذا قصور في الرد والاحتجاج والبحث.

This intercession constitutes innovation-driven intercession, which leads to general shirk and specifically to shirk-related intercession. It falls under the category of innovative mediation as mentioned by Sheikh Bakr Abu Zaid.

In contrast, supplicating entities other than Allah for matters only Allah can control, such as asking someone other than Allah to provide offspring, is major shirk in itself. The shirk belief is not a prerequisite for this ruling to be considered major disbelief. Pay attention to the differences.

It would have been better if the writer had stopped his error at the limit of objecting to what is beyond the scope of dispute in Ibn Taymiyyah's statements. Instead, he further complicated matters by attributing to Ibn Taymiyyah statements that align with his own views and neglecting to respond to other arguments that are part of Ibn Taymiyyah's overall discourse, while expanding on the claim that the conveyance of what he quotes is unequivocal evidence for his position.

The writer also misled the reader into believing that dissenters are either obscure or heretical and that there is no evidence for them from Ibn Taymiyyah's statements other than a single ambiguous argument, without addressing their numerous and varied arguments, let alone responding to them. This is a deficiency in refutation, argumentation, and research.

ولو لم يكن إلا قول ابن تيمية رحمه الله: "وأما من يأتي إلى قبر نبي أو رجل صالح، أو من يعتقد فيه أنه قبر نبي أو رجل صالح وليس كذلك، ويسأله ويستنجده، فهذا على ثلاث درجات: أحدها: أن يسأل حاجته مثل أن يسأله أن يزيل مرضه أو مرض دوابه أو يقضي دينه أو ينتقم له من عدوه أو يعافي نفسه وأهله ودوابه، ونحو ذلك مما لا يقدر عليه إلا الله تعالى، فهذا شرك صريح، يجب أن يستتاب منه صاحبه، فإن تاب وإلا قتل. وإن قال: أنا أسأله لكونه أقرب إلى الله مني ليشفع لي في هذه الأمور، ولأني أتوسل إلى الله به كما يتوسل إلى السلطان بخواصه وأعوانه، فهذه من أفعال المشركين والنصارى؛ فإنهم يزعمون أنهم يتخذون أحبارهم ورهبانهم شفعاء يستشفعون بهم في مطالبهم، وكذلك أخبر الله عن المشركين أنهم قالوا {ما نعبدهم إلا ليقربونا إلى الله زلفى}..."، إلى أن قال: "وإن قلت: هذا إذا دعا الله أجاب دعاءه أعظم مما يجيبه إذا دعوته أنا. فهذا القسم الثاني: **وهو ألا تطلب منه الفعل، ولا تدعوه، ولكن تطلب أن يدعو لك، كما تقول للحي ادع لي**، وكما كان الصحابة رضوان الله عليهم يطلبون من النبي ﷺ الدعاء، فهذا مشروع في الحي كما تقدم، وأما الميت من الأنبياء والصالحين وغيرهم، فلم يشرع لنا أن نقول: ادع لنا، ولا: اسأل لنا ربك، ولا نحو ذلك، لم يفعل هذا أحد من الصحابة والتابعين، ولا أمر به أحد من الأئمة، ولا ورد في ذلك حديث..." اللمعة في الأجوبة السبعة ص31-37، حيث سمى الدرجات الثلاث سؤالا، وجعل (سؤال الميت الدعاء عند قبره كما يسأل الحي) قسيما لما هو شرك أكبر: من سؤال غير الله ما لا يقدر عليه إلا الله ـ وهذا حقيقة (صريح الدعاء) ـ، ومن السؤال المتضمن للشفاعة المنفية في كتاب الله، وجعل درجته مغايرة لدرجتيهما؛ لكان كافيا لإبطال دعوى تكررت من الكاتب في تعليقه على أربعة نقولات من عشرة، وهي كون ما يحتج بنقله عن ابن تيمية صريحا في دلالته على ما ينسبه له من معاني، لما في قوله هذا من مغايرة بين الدرجات في حقيقة كل منها، ومن مغايرة بين القسمين في حكم كل واحد منهما.

وهذا الذي يزعم الكاتب أنه شرك أكبر، وأن كلام ابن تيمية في ذلك صريح، قد سوغ أشهر صوره ـ وهي سؤال النبي ﷺ عند قبره أن يدعو الله للسائل بالمغفرة ـ جمهور المتأخرين من أهل العلم، كما ذكر ابن تيمية وهو معلوم من كتبهم الفقهية، ومنهم القاضي عياض وابن عقيل وابن قدامة المقدسي وأبي الفرج المقدسي والماوردي والنووي، ومن بعدهم البهوتي والشوكاني وغيرهم.

[15] وقد أوصلها أحد طلبة العلم إلى خمسة عشر نقلا ـ وهي أقوى وأوضح دلالة مما احتج به الكاتب ـ، وسيأتي سردها باختصار عند التعليق على الخاتمة.

-

And if it were only the statement of Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy on him:

"As for those who come to the grave of a prophet or a righteous man—or what they believe to be the grave of a prophet or a righteous man, though it may not be so—and ask him for help or seek his assistance, this has three levels:

The first level: *That they ask him for their needs, such as asking him to cure their illness or the illness of their animals, to repay their debts, to take revenge on their enemies, to grant well-being to themselves, their families, and their animals, or other such things that only Allah is capable of. This is clear shirk, and the person doing it must be asked to repent. If they repent, they are forgiven; otherwise, they should be executed.*

If someone says, 'I am asking him because he is closer to Allah than I am, to intercede for me in these matters, or because I seek to draw closer to Allah through him, as one seeks a ruler's favor through

their confidants and aides,' this is among the actions of the polytheists and Christians. They claim that they take their rabbis and monks as intercessors to fulfill their requests. Likewise, Allah informed us about the polytheists who said: {We only worship them so that they may bring us closer to Allah in position} [Qur'an 39:3].

The second level: *If someone says, 'When he calls upon Allah, his prayer is more likely to be answered than mine,' this is a different case. Here, they do not ask the person directly or invoke them but ask them to pray for them, as one might say to a living person, 'Pray for me,' similar to how the Companions, may Allah be pleased with them, would ask the Prophet (peace be upon him) to pray for them. This is permissible for the living, as previously mentioned. However, for the dead, whether they are prophets, righteous individuals, or others, it has not been legislated for us to say: 'Pray for us' or 'Ask your Lord for us' or anything similar. None of the Companions or the Followers (Tabi'een) ever did this, nor did any of the Imams command it, and no hadith has been narrated to support it."*

(Al-Lum'a fi al-Ajwiba al-Sab'a, pp. 31–37).

Ibn Taymiyyah classified the three levels as forms of "asking" and made "asking the dead for supplication at their graves as one would ask the living" distinct from major shirk, such as asking anyone other than Allah for what only Allah can do—which is the essence of supplication—and from asking for intercession negated in the Qur'an. He assigned it a different level from the other two in its reality and ruling.

The claim made by the author, that this is major shirk and that Ibn Taymiyyah's words on this are explicit, is refuted by the fact that Ibn Taymiyyah stated that the most well-known practice of this type—asking the Prophet (peace be upon him) at his grave to pray to Allah to forgive the supplicant—was permitted by the majority of later scholars. Ibn Taymiyyah himself noted this, and it is evident in their jurisprudential works, including those of Qadi Iyad, Ibn Aqil, Ibn Qudamah al-Maqdisi, Abu al-Faraj al-Maqdisi, al-Mawardi, al-Nawawi, and, later, al-Buhuti, al-Shawkani, and others.

One student of knowledge has documented fifteen statements on this issue—statements stronger and clearer than those cited by the author—and these will be summarized briefly in the commentary on the conclusion.

ووردت به أحاديث لا يصح منها شيء: حديث مالك الدار، وحكاية العتبي، والزيادة التي في حديث عثمان بن حنيف، أوردها محدثون في دواوين السنة المشهورة دون استنكار لمتنها، ولا قول أحد منهم بأن هذا مما دسته الزنادقة، وفيهم ابن أبي شيبة والطبراني وكلاهما ألف في اعتقاد أهل السنة [16]، ولم يعتبرها أحد من جملة مشكل الحديث والآثار [17].

كما أورد بعض أئمة التفسير - كالقرطبي وابن كثير - عند تفسير قوله تعالى {وَلَوْ أَنَّهُمْ إِذ ظَّلَمُوا أَنفُسَهُمْ جَاءُوكَ فَاسْتَغْفَرُوا اللَّهَ وَاسْتَغْفَرَ لَهُمُ الرَّسُولُ}، حكاية العتبي دون تعقب لها، وأوردها بعض فقهاء الحنابلة والشافعية كالماوردي وابن قدامة وأبي الفرج المقدسي والنووي في مصنفاتهم الفقهية في كتاب الحج [18]، مقررين لمضمونها، ومستأنسين بها [19]، وصرح النووي باستحسان الماوردي وغيره لها.

فأنَّى يكون سؤال الميت الدعاء عند قبره كما يسأل الحي شركا أكبر، وأن هذا من الوضوح بمكان!!

وأما اعتبار هذا بدعة منكرة وشركا أصغر فهذا لا إشكال فيه، وهو الحق بلا مرية.

ويدل على كونه محدثا في الدين مفهوم قوله ﷺ لعائشة رضي الله عنها لما اشتكت وجعا في رأسها: "ذاك لو كان وأنا حيّ فأستغفر لك وأدعو" رواه البخاري في صحيحه [رقم:5666].

والله الهادي.

-

There are hadiths related to this matter, but none of them are authentic. These include the hadith of Malik al-Dar, the story of al-'Utbi, and the addition found in the hadith of Uthman ibn Haneef. These were cited by hadith scholars in the well-known collections of the Sunnah without any objection to

their content or any claim that they were fabricated by heretics. Among these scholars were Ibn Abi Shaybah and al-Tabarani, both of whom authored works on the beliefs of Ahl al-Sunnah. None of them classified these narrations as problematic hadiths or reports.

Similarly, some exegetes, such as al-Qurtubi and Ibn Kathir, mentioned the story of al-'Utbi in their commentary on the verse:

> *"If only, when they wronged themselves, they had come to you, and asked forgiveness of Allah, and the Messenger had asked forgiveness for them…"* [Qur'an 4:64].

They included the story without criticizing it. Likewise, some jurists of the Hanbali and Shafi'i schools, such as al-Mawardi, Ibn Qudamah, Abu al-Faraj al-Maqdisi, and al-Nawawi, included it in their jurisprudential works in the section on Hajj, affirming its content and using it as supporting evidence, with al-Nawawi noting al-Mawardi's and others' approval of it.

How, then, can asking the deceased for supplication at their graves, as one would ask the living, be considered major shirk, when the matter is far from clear in this regard?

As for considering it a reprehensible innovation (*bid'ah*) and minor shirk, there is no dispute about this; it is the truth without any doubt.

This is supported by the Prophet's statement to Aisha, may Allah be pleased with her, when she complained of a headache:

> *"That would be if I were alive, so I could seek forgiveness for you and supplicate for you."*

This was narrated by al-Bukhari in his *Sahih* [Hadith No. 5666].

And Allah is the Guide.

Footnote

---

[16] فقد أخرجا حديث مالك الدار وهو أصحها ـ أي أقلها ضعفا ـ.

[17] ونحو هذا المعنى من الاحتجاج نجده في رد شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية على البكري منعه الاستدلال بحديث: "إنه لا يستغاث بي، وإنما يستغاث بالله"، حيث قال رحمه الله: "وقد روى الناس هذا الحديث من أكثر من خمسمائة سنة إن كان ضعيفاً، وإلا فهو مروي من زمان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم، وما زال العلماء يقرؤون ذلك ويسمعونه في المجالس الكبار والصغار، ولم يقل أحد من المسلمين إن إطلاق القول: إنه لا يستغاث بالنبي ﷺ كفر ولا حرام، وكان في إيراده بيان تقدم تكلم العلماء والسلف بهذا اللفظ، ولو كان عبد الله بن لهيعة ذاكراً لا أثراً لم ينكره المسلمون عليه؛ لكان في ذلك مستند لهذا الإطلاق، فإن الرجل قاضي مصر في ذلك الزمان وهو من أكبر العلماء المفتين ونظير لليث بن سعد، والغلط الذي وقع في حديثه لا يمنعه أن يكون من أهل الاجتهاد والفتيا" الاستغاثة في الرد على البكري ص119.

[18] انظر: المغني لابن قدامة 3/478-479، والشرح الكبير لأبي الفرج المقدسي 3/494-495، والمجموع للنووي 8/274-275.

[19] قال شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية رحمه الله: "ولهذا كان العلماء متفقين على جواز الاعتضاد والترجيح بما لا يصلح أن يكون هو العمدة؛ من الأخبار التي تُكلم في بعض رواتها لسوء حفظ أو نحو ذلك، وبآثار الصحابة والتابعين، بل بأقوال المشايخ والإسرائيليات والمنامات مما يصلح للاعتضاد، فما يصلح للاعتضاد نوع وما يصلح للاعتماد نوع" الاستغاثة في الرد على البكري ص118 [ت:السهلي].

Translation of footnote:

Both Ibn Abi Shaybah and al-Tabarani recorded the hadith of Malik al-Dar, which is considered the most reliable among them—meaning, the least weak. A similar line of reasoning can be found in Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah's refutation of al-Bakri, where he addressed the use of the hadith: *"It is not to me that help is sought; rather, help is sought from Allah."* He said, may Allah have mercy on him:

> *"This hadith has been transmitted by people for more than five hundred years. Even if it is weak, it has been narrated since the time of the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him). Scholars have continually read and heard it in both major and minor gatherings.*

> *Not a single Muslim has ever claimed that using the statement, 'Help is not sought from the Prophet (peace be upon him)' constitutes disbelief or is prohibited. Its inclusion illustrates that scholars and the righteous predecessors have long spoken in these terms. If Abdullah ibn Lahia had merely narrated it as a report without attribution, Muslims would not have cited it. The fact that it has been transmitted from him provides a basis for the usage of this expression. Abdullah ibn Lahia was a judge in Egypt at the time and one of the greatest scholar-jurists, comparable to al-Layth ibn Sa'd. Although his narrations contained errors, that did not prevent him from being a scholar of independent reasoning (ijtihad) and issuing legal rulings."* (*Al-Istighatha fi al-Radd 'ala al-Bakri*, p. 119).

Refer to: *Al-Mughni* by Ibn Qudamah, 3/478–479; *Al-Sharh al-Kabir* by Abu al-Faraj al-Maqdisi, 3/494–495; *Al-Majmu'* by al-Nawawi, 8/274–275.

Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah also said, may Allah have mercy on him:

> *"This is why the scholars unanimously agree on the permissibility of using what is not suitable as a primary basis (*'umda*) for support (*i'tidad*) and preference (*tarjeeh*). This includes reports from narrators criticized for poor memory or similar reasons, as well as the reports of the Companions and Followers, the statements of the elders, accounts from the Israelites, and dreams—provided they are suitable for support (*i'tidad*). What is valid for support is one category, and what is valid as a foundational basis is another category."* (*Al-Istighatha fi al-Radd 'ala al-Bakri*, p. 118 [ed. al-Sahli]).

الرد المفصل:

ونشرع في بيان المقصود:

التعليق على النقل الأول: من التوسل والوسيلة، وتقديمه لهذا النقل على غيره يفيد ـ كما هو العادة في البحوث العلمية ـ أنه أقوى ما احتج به، وختمه بقوله: "وهذا نص صريح في أنه يرى أن طلب الدعاء من أموات شرك"، يريد الشرك الأكبر.
وقد أخرج المنقول عن سياقه، واجتزأه منه اجتزاء مخلا، فأطلق ما هو مقيد، وهذا سيجعلنا نفسر كلام ابن تيمية على غير مراده.
ونأتي على كلام ابن تيمية كاملا وهو في مجموع الفتاوى 1/ 158-159:

"وَالْمُشْرِكُونَ مِنْ هَؤُلَاءِ قَدْ يَقُولُونَ: إنَّا نَسْتَشْفِعُ بِهِمْ أَيْ نَطْلُبُ مِنْ الْمَلَائِكَةِ وَالْأَنْبِيَاءِ أَنْ يَشْفَعُوا فَإِذَا أَتَيْنَا قَبْرَ أَحَدِهِمْ طَلَبْنَا مِنْهُ أَنْ يَشْفَعَ لَنَا فَإِذَا صَوَّرْنَا تِمْثَالَهُ - وَالتَّمَاثِيلُ إمَّا مُجَسَّدَةٌ وَإِمَّا تَمَاثِيلُ مُصَوَّرَةٌ كَمَا يُصَوِّرُهَا النَّصَارَى فِي كَنَائِسِهِمْ - قَالُوا: فَمَقْصُودُنَا بِهَذِهِ التَّمَاثِيلِ تَذَكُّرُ أَصْحَابِهَا وسِيَرِهِمْ وَنَحْنُ نُخَاطِبُ هَذِهِ التَّمَاثِيلَ وَمَقْصُودُنَا خِطَابُ أَصْحَابِهَا لِيَشْفَعُوا لَنَا إلَى اللَّهِ.

-

The Detailed Response:

We begin with clarifying the intended meaning.

Commentary on the First Citation:

The excerpt is from *Al-Tawassul wal-Wasilah*. Presenting this citation before others implies—as is the norm in scholarly research—that it is the strongest evidence presented. The author concluded it by saying: *"This is an explicit statement that Ibn Taymiyyah considers requesting supplication from the dead as shirk,"* referring here to major shirk.

However, the quoted text was taken out of context and selectively excerpted in a way that distorts its meaning. It generalized what was a restricted statement, leading us to interpret Ibn Taymiyyah's words contrary to his intent.

We will present Ibn Taymiyyah’s complete statement, which appears in *Majmu‘ al-Fatawa* (1/158-159):

> *“The polytheists among these groups may say: ‘We seek intercession through them,’ meaning we request from the angels and prophets to intercede for us. When we come to the grave of one of them, we ask them to intercede for us. If we create an image of them—whether it be a physical statue or a pictorial representation, as the Christians depict in their churches—we claim that our purpose in making these images is to remember their lives and virtues. We address these images, intending to address their subjects, asking them to intercede for us with Allah.”*

-

فَيَقُولُ أَحَدُهُمْ: يَا سَيِّدِي فُلَانٌ أَوْ يَا سَيِّدِي جرجس أَوْ بِطْرِس أَوْ يَا سِتِّي الْحَنُونَةُ مَرْيَمُ أَوْ يَا سَيِّدِي الْخَلِيلُ أَوْ مُوسَى بْنَ عِمْرَانَ أَوْ غَيْرَ ذَلِكَ اشْفَعْ لِي إلَى رَبِّك.
[[من هنا بدأ نقل الكاتب]] وَقَدْ يُخَاطِبُونَ الْمَيِّتَ عِنْدَ قَبْرِهِ: سَلْ لِي رَبَّك.
أَوْ يُخَاطِبُونَ الْحَيَّ وَهُوَ غَائِبٌ كَمَا يُخَاطِبُونَهُ لَوْ كَانَ حَاضِرًا حَيًّا.
وَيُنْشِدُونَ قَصَائِدَ يَقُولُ أَحَدُهُمْ فِيهَا: يَا سَيِّدِي فُلَانٌ أَنَا فِي حَسْبِك أَنَا فِي جِوَارِك اشْفَعْ لِي إلَى اللَّهِ.
سَلْ اللَّهَ لَنَا أَنْ يَنْصُرَنَا عَلَى عَدُوِّنَا سَلْ اللَّهَ أَنْ يَكْشِفَ عَنَّا هَذِهِ الشِّدَّةَ أَشْكُو إلَيْك كَذَا وَكَذَا فَسَلْ اللَّهَ أَنْ يَكْشِفَ هَذِهِ الْكُرْبَةَ.
أَوْ يَقُولُ أَحَدُهُمْ: سَلْ اللَّهَ أَنْ يَغْفِرَ لِي.
وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَتَأَوَّلُ قَوْله تَعَالَى {وَلَوْ أَنَّهُمْ إذْ ظَلَمُوا أَنْفُسَهُمْ جَاءُوك فَاسْتَغْفَرُوا اللَّهَ وَاسْتَغْفَرَ لَهُمُ الرَّسُولُ لَوَجَدُوا اللَّهَ تَوَّابًا رَحِيمًا} وَيَقُولُونَ: إذَا طَلَبْنَا مِنْهُ الِاسْتِغْفَارَ بَعْدَ مَوْتِهِ كُنَّا بِمَنْزِلَةِ الَّذِينَ طَلَبُوا الِاسْتِغْفَارَ مِنْ الصَّحَابَةِ وَيُخَالِفُونَ بِذَلِكَ إجْمَاعَ الصَّحَابَةِ وَالتَّابِعِينَ لَهُمْ بِإِحْسَانِ وَسَائِرَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ فَإِنَّ أَحَدًا مِنْهُمْ لَمْ يَطْلُبْ مِنْ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بَعْدَ مَوْتِهِ أَنْ يَشْفَعَ لَهُ وَلَا سَأَلَهُ شَيْئًا وَلَا ذَكَرَ ذَلِكَ أَحَدٌ مِنْ أَئِمَّةِ الْمُسْلِمِينَ فِي كُتُبِهِمْ وَإِنَّمَا ذَكَرَ ذَلِكَ مَنْ ذَكَرَهُ مِنْ مُتَأَخِّرِي الْفُقَهَاءِ وَحَكَوْا حِكَايَةً مَكْذُوبَةً عَلَى مَالِكٍ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ سَيَأْتِي ذِكْرُهَا وَبَسْطُ الْكَلَامِ عَلَيْهَا إنْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى.
فَهَذِهِ الْأَنْوَاعُ مِنْ خِطَابِ الْمَلَائِكَةِ وَالْأَنْبِيَاءِ وَالصَّالِحِينَ بَعْدَ مَوْتِهِمْ عِنْدَ قُبُورِهِمْ وَفِي مَغِيبِهِمْ وَخِطَابِ تَمَاثِيلِهِمْ هُوَ مِنْ أَعْظَمِ أَنْوَاعِ الشِّرْكِ الْمَوْجُودِ فِي الْمُشْرِكِينَ مِنْ غَيْرِ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ وَفِي مُبْتَدِعَةِ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ وَالْمُسْلِمِينَ الَّذِينَ أَحْدَثُوا مِنْ الشِّرْكِ وَالْعِبَادَاتِ مَا لَمْ يَأْذَنْ بِهِ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى*[[هنا انتهى نقل الكاتب]]*. قَالَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى: {أَمْ لَهُمْ شُرَكَاءُ شَرَعُوا لَهُمْ مِنَ الدِّينِ مَا لَمْ يَأْذَنْ بِهِ اللَّهُ}. فَإِنَّ دُعَاءَ الْمَلَائِكَةِ وَالْأَنْبِيَاءِ بَعْدَ مَوْتِهِمْ وَفِي مَغِيبِهِمْ وَسُؤَالَهُمْ وَالِاسْتِغَاثَةَ بِهِمْ وَالِاسْتِشْفَاعَ بِهِمْ فِي هَذِهِ الْحَالِ وَنَصْبَ تَمَاثِيلِهِمْ - بِمَعْنَى طَلَبِ الشَّفَاعَةِ مِنْهُمْ - هُوَ مِنْ الدِّينِ الَّذِي لَمْ يَشْرَعْهُ اللَّهُ وَلَا ابْتَعَثَ بِهِ رَسُولًا وَلَا أَنْزَلَ بِهِ كِتَابًا وَلَيْسَ هُوَ وَاجِبًا وَلَا مُسْتَحَبًّا بِاتِّفَاقِ الْمُسْلِمِينَ وَلَا فَعَلَهُ أَحَدٌ مِنْ الصَّحَابَةِ وَالتَّابِعِينَ لَهُمْ بِإِحْسَانِ وَلَا أَمَرَ بِهِ إمَامٌ مِنْ أَئِمَّةِ الْمُسْلِمِينَ وَإِنْ كَانَ ذَلِكَ مِمَّا يَفْعَلُهُ كَثِيرٌ" اهـ.

-

So one of them says: "O my master so-and-so," or "O my master George or Butros," or "O my kind mistress Mary," or "O my master Abraham the Beloved, or Moses son of Imran, or others—intercede for me to your Lord."

From here, the author began his citation:

> *"And they may address the deceased at their graves, saying: ‘Ask your Lord for me.’ Or they may address a living person while he is absent, just as they would address him if he were present and alive. They recite poems in which one of them says: ‘O my master so-and-so, I seek refuge in your protection. I am under your care. Intercede for me with Allah. Ask Allah to grant us victory over our enemy. Ask Allah to remove this hardship from us. I complain to you about such-and-such, so ask Allah to relieve this distress.’ Or one of them may say: ‘Ask Allah to forgive me.’*
>
> And some of them misinterpret the verse of Allah, Exalted is He: *‘If only, when they wronged themselves, they had come to you and asked Allah for forgiveness, and the Messenger had asked forgiveness for them, they would have found Allah accepting of repentance and merciful’* [Qur'an 4:64]. They say: ‘If we ask him for forgiveness after his death, we are like those who asked for forgiveness during the Prophet’s lifetime.’ Yet they contradict the consensus of the Companions and those who followed them in righteousness, as well as the consensus of all other Muslims. Not one of them ever sought anything from the Prophet (peace be upon him) after his death, nor did they ask him to intercede for them, nor did they ask him for anything. None of this was

> mentioned by any of the imams of the Muslims in their writings. Rather, this was only mentioned by later jurists, who narrated a fabricated story attributed to Malik (may Allah be pleased with him), which will be discussed in detail later, God willing.
>
> Such types of addressing the angels, prophets, and righteous people after their deaths at their graves, or when they are absent, as well as addressing their statues, are among the gravest forms of shirk found among the polytheists who are not from the People of the Book. It is also found among heretics from the People of the Book and Muslims who innovated in their religion acts of shirk and worship that Allah, Exalted is He, did not permit."

Here ends the author’s citation.

> Allah, Exalted is He, says: *‘Or do they have partners who have legislated for them in religion that which Allah has not allowed?’* [Qur'an 42:21]. Thus, calling upon the angels and prophets after their deaths or when they are absent, asking them for help, intercession, or assistance, and erecting statues of them for the purpose of seeking intercession are all forms of religious practices that Allah did not legislate. He did not send a Messenger with them nor reveal any scripture for them. These practices are neither obligatory nor recommended by the consensus of Muslims. None of the Companions, nor those who followed them in righteousness, performed them, nor did any of the imams of the Muslims command them. Although many people may engage in such acts, they are not supported by the religion."

End of quotation.

وإذا تأملنا سياق كلامه نجده متعلقا في أوله: بالنصارى والمنتسبين للإسلام، ثم عممه على جميع أصناف من أشرك ومعلوم من حال الكفار الأصليين أن مرادهم بطلب الشفاعة، هو الشفاعة المنفية في القرآن، كما قال الله سبحانه على لسانهم {ما نعبدهم إلا ليقربونا إلى الله زلفى} [الزمر:3]، قال مجاهد رحمه الله في تفسير الآية: "قريش تقوله للأوثان، ومن قبلهم يقوله للملائكة ولعيسى ابن مريم ولعزير" رواه ابن جرير في تفسيره، وهي بذاتها شرك أكبر طلب المرء منهم أو لم يطلب، وأيا كانت صورة الطلب.

و يؤكد كون كلام ابن تيمية مقيدا بما ذكرت قوله في آخره: "فَإِنَّ دُعَاءَ الْمَلَائِكَةِ وَالْأَنْبِيَاءِ بَعْدَ مَوْتِهِمْ وَفِي مَغِيبِهِمْ وَسُؤَالَهُمْ وَالِاسْتِغَاثَةَ بِهِمْ وَالِاسْتِشْفَاعَ بِهِمْ فِي هَذِهِ الْحَالِ وَنَصْبَ تَمَاثِيلِهِمْ - بِمَعْنَى طَلَبِ الشَّفَاعَةِ مِنْهُمْ -"، وتأمل قوله: "بِمَعْنَى طَلَبِ الشَّفَاعَةِ مِنْهُمْ"، فهذا يقيد ما قبله، وقد أهمله الكاتب.

ولو أن الكاتب أمعن النظر فيما اكتفى بنقله، وحمله على المعهود من دين مشركي العرب وأهل الكتاب لتبين له أن كلام ابن تيمية يدور حول ما كان مصحوبا من أقوالهم بالشفاعة المنفية الشركية، وعليه يحمل ما ذكره حول المنتسبين للإسلام [20]، وهذا ما يجعل النقل الأول خارج محل النزاع.

-

And if we consider the context of his statement, we find it initially related to Christians and those affiliated with Islam, and then he generalizes it to all categories of those who commit shirk. It is well-known regarding the original disbelievers that their intention in requesting intercession was the type of intercession negated in the Qur'an, as Allah, the Exalted, said about them: *“We only worship them so they may bring us closer to Allah in position”* [Az-Zumar: 3]. Mujahid, may Allah have mercy on him, said in the interpretation of the verse: *“Quraysh would say this about their idols, and those before them would say it about angels, Jesus son of Mary, and Uzayr”*—as narrated by Ibn Jarir in his Tafsir. This, in itself, is major shirk, whether a person requests something from them or not, and regardless of the form of the request.

What confirms that Ibn Taymiyyah’s statement is restricted to what I mentioned is his conclusion: *“For invoking the angels and prophets after their death and in their absence, asking them for help, seeking their aid, and requesting intercession from them in this state, or erecting statues of them—with the meaning of seeking intercession from them”*—and reflect on his phrase: *“with the meaning of*

seeking intercession from them." This restricts what came before, which the author overlooked. If the author had considered what he quoted and interpreted it in light of the known practices of the polytheists of Arabia and the People of the Book, it would have become clear to him that Ibn Taymiyyah's words revolve around what was accompanied in their statements by the type of intercession that constitutes shirk. Based on this, what Ibn Taymiyyah mentioned about those affiliated with Islam is understood. This renders the first citation outside the scope of the dispute.

Footnote:

[20] أي من سماهم بـمبتدعة المسلمين، وسيأتي مزيد إيضاح لوجه هذه التسمية عند التعليق على النقل الثالث.

-

20 That is, those he referred to as innovators among the Muslims, and further clarification of the reason for this designation will follow in the commentary on the third citation.

Regular text:

فإن قال قائل: ها أنت بهذا تثبت ما تحاول نفيه، وتجعل ابن تيمية ينسب لمتأخري الفقهاء كالقاضي عياض المالكي والماوردي الشافعي وابن قدامة وأبي الفرج المقدسيين الحنبليين وغيرهم الشفاعة الشركية المنفية في كتاب الله، حيث قال في نفس السياق: "وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَتَأَوَّلُ قَوْله تَعَالَى {وَلَوْ أَنَّهُمْ إذْ ظَلَمُوا أَنْفُسَهُمْ جَاءُوك فَاسْتَغْفَرُوا اللَّهَ وَاسْتَغْفَرَ لَهُمُ الرَّسُولُ لَوَجَدُوا اللَّهَ تَوَّابًا رَحِيمًا} وَيَقُولُونَ: إذَا طَلَبْنَا مِنْهُ الِاسْتِغْفَارَ بَعْدَ مَوْتِهِ كُنَّا بِمَنْزِلَةِ الَّذِينَ طَلَبُوا الِاسْتِغْفَارَ مِنَ الصَّحَابَةِ وَيُخَالِفُونَ بِذَلِكَ إجْمَاعَ الصَّحَابَةِ وَالتَّابِعِينَ لَهُمْ بِإِحْسَانِ وَسَائِرَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ فَإِنَّ أَحَدًا مِنْهُمْ لَمْ يَطْلُبْ مِنْ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بَعْدَ مَوْتِهِ أَنْ يَشْفَعَ لَهُ وَلَا سَأَلَهُ شَيْئًا وَلَا ذَكَرَ ذَلِكَ أَحَدٌ مِنْ أَئِمَّةِ الْمُسْلِمِينَ فِي كُتُبِهِمْ وَإِنَّمَا ذَكَرَ ذَلِكَ مَنْ ذَكَرَهُ مِنْ مُتَأَخِّرِي الْفُقَهَاءِ وَحَكَوْا حِكَايَةً مَكْذُوبَةً عَلَى مَالِكٍ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ".

فجوابه: أن هذا باطل، وإنما يُحمل كلامه على أنه ورد ذكر قولهم استطرادا، وذلك لورود كلام صريح له، ذكره في أكثر من موطن، على أن ما قالوه ذريعة مفضية إلى الشرك وعبادته ودعائه من دون الله وإلى اتخاذ قبره وثنا يعبد [21]، وغير ذلك من أقواله الدالة على أنه لا يعدّ ذلك شركا أكبر بإطلاق [22]، وكلامه يفسر بعضه بعضا.

ولعلّ الذي دفع ابن تيمية إلى هذا الاستطراد ـ والله أعلم ـ وجود أناس من القبورية، يعتبرون مسألة "سؤال الميت الدعاء عند قبره" مسوغة لما هم عليه مما حقيقته الشفاعة الشركية المنفية في كتاب الله، وهذا أمر معلوم عن مشايخ القبورية حيث يخلطون بين هذه المسألة، وبين التوجه للميت بصريح الدعاء بنية سؤاله الدعاء، بحجة المجاز العقلي وأن لا مؤثر حقيقة إلا الله تعالى، فجعلوا الميت واسطة لا في "سؤال الدعاء" بل في "صريح الدعاء"، وهذا مستلزم للشفاعة الشركية [23]، كما أننا نجد مشايخ القبورية يسمون كلا الصورتين "استغاثة" و"استشفاعا"، ولعله لهذا قال ابن تيمية في آخر كلامه:"فَإِنَّ دُعَاءَ الْمَلَائِكَةِ وَالْأَنْبِيَاءِ بَعْدَ مَوْتِهِمْ وَفِي مَغِيبِهِمْ وَسُؤَالَهُمْ وَالِاسْتِغَاثَةَ بِهِمْ وَالِاسْتِشْفَاعَ بِهِمْ فِي هَذِهِ الْحَالِ وَنَصْبَ تَمَاثِيلِهِمْ - بِمَعْنَى طَلَبِ الشَّفَاعَةِ مِنْهُمْ -".

وأيا كان فكلامه ليس بصريح فيما ادعاه الكاتب، والله أعلم.

-

If someone says: "You are, in this way, affirming what you are trying to deny, making Ibn Taymiyyah attribute to later jurists—such as Qadi Iyad of the Maliki school, Al-Mawardi of the Shafi'i school, Ibn Qudamah, and Abu Al-Faraj of the Hanbali school, among others—the concept of intercession that is denied in the Qur'an," where he states in the same context:

"And among them are those who interpret the verse: {And if, when they wronged themselves, they had come to you and asked Allah's forgiveness, and the Messenger had asked forgiveness for them, they would have found Allah accepting of repentance and merciful} [An-Nisa:64], and they say: 'If we seek forgiveness from him after his death, it is akin to those who sought forgiveness from him during his lifetime.' In doing so, they oppose the consensus of the Companions, the Tabi'un, and the rest of

the Muslims, for none of them sought from the Prophet ﷺ, after his death, to intercede for them, nor did they ask him for anything, nor did any of the leading scholars of Islam mention this in their writings. This was only mentioned by some later jurists, who also narrated a fabricated story about Malik, may Allah be pleased with him."

The response is: This is false. Rather, Ibn Taymiyyah's statement should be understood as mentioning their claim incidentally, as he has explicitly stated in multiple instances that what they have said is a means leading to shirk, worshiping the deceased, and invoking them besides Allah, as well as turning his grave into an idol to be worshiped. This, along with other statements of his, indicates that he does not classify this as unequivocal major shirk. His statements explain one another.

Perhaps what prompted Ibn Taymiyyah to make this incidental mention—Allah knows best—was the presence of some among the grave-worshipers who consider the issue of “asking the deceased for supplication at their graves” as justification for their practices, which in essence represent the intercession denied in the Qur'an. This is a well-known position of the leaders of the grave-worshipers, who conflate this issue with directly supplicating to the deceased with the intention of asking them for intercession. They justify this with claims of metaphorical reasoning, asserting that only Allah truly has influence, making the deceased a mediator—not merely for “asking for supplication” but in direct and explicit supplication itself. This necessarily involves intercession that constitutes shirk. Moreover, we find the leaders of the grave-worshipers labeling both forms—explicit supplication and asking for supplication—as "seeking help" (istighathah) and "seeking intercession" (istishfa'). It is likely for this reason that Ibn Taymiyyah said at the end of his statement: *"For invoking the angels and prophets after their death or in their absence, asking them, seeking help from them, and interceding through them in this manner, as well as erecting their statues—as a means of requesting their intercession—is a practice not legislated by Allah."*

In any case, his statement does not explicitly support the claim made by the author, and Allah knows best.

Footnote:

---

[21] انظر: قاعدة جليلة في التوسل والوسيلة ص289 (الفقرة رقم:769) [= الفتاوى 330/1] وتلخيص كتاب الاستغاثة 244/1 و454.

[22] سيأتي سردها جميعا وذكر مصادرها في القسم الثاني من التعليق على ما ختم به الكاتب مؤلفه، وقد بلغت خمسة عشر نقلا أهلمها الكاتب ولم يأت عليها بذكر!!

[23] سيأتي مزيد بيان لهذا عند التعليق على النقل الرابع.

-

See: *A Significant Principle in Tawassul and the Means*, p. 289 (paragraph no. 769) [= *Al-Fatawa*, 330/1], and *A Summary of the Book of Istighatha* 244/1 and 454.

21. All of these will be listed and their sources mentioned in the second section of the commentary on how the author concluded his work. They amount to fifteen quotations that the author ignored and did not mention at all!!
22. Further clarification on this will come in the commentary on the fourth quotation.

Regular text:

التعليق على النقل الثاني: من اقتضاء الصراط المستقيم، ومحل الشاهد مما نقله قوله: "...فكيف إذا وجد ما هو نوع الشرك من الرغبة إليهم، سواء طلب منهم قضاء الحاجات، وتفريج الكربات، أو طلب منهم أن يطلبوا ذلك من الله تعالى"، ووصفه بأنه نص صريح في عدم التفرقة بين الدعاء وطلب الدعاء.

وليس الأمر كذلك إذ هو مقيد ههنا بـ"الرغبة إليهم" - إذ "من" التي قبلها بيانيّة - وهو الرجاء، وهو عبادة قلبية مستقلة، قال تعالى {وإلى ربك فارغب}، ووصف سبحانه زكريا وزوجه وابنهما يحيى عليهم السلام بقوله {يدعوننا رغبا ورهبا}، فمن صرفها لغير الله وقع في الشرك الأكبر ولو لم يطلب، أيا كانت صورة الطلب، وهذا خارج محل النزاع.

وأيا كان فكلامه ليس بصريح خلافا لما ادعاه الكاتب.
والله أعلم.

-

Commentary on the Second Quotation from *Iqtida’ al-Sirat al-Mustaqim*

The relevant portion of the quoted text is:
"… So how about when there is a form of shirk present, such as turning to them with desire, whether by asking them to fulfill needs and alleviate distresses, or asking them to request such things from Allah the Exalted."

The author described this as an explicit text indicating no distinction between supplicating directly (du‘a’) and asking for supplication (requesting du‘a’).

However, this is not the case, as the phrase here is specifically restricted by "turning to them with desire" (*rughbah ilayhim*), where "min" preceding it is explanatory. This refers to *raja’* (hope), which is an independent act of worship of the heart. Allah Most High says:
"And turn your hope to your Lord alone" (*Surah Al-Inshirah: 8*).
Allah also described Zakariya, his wife, and their son Yahya (peace be upon them) with His words:
"They used to call upon Us in hope and fear" (*Surah Al-Anbiya: 90*).

Whoever directs such hope toward other than Allah falls into major shirk, even without making any form of request, regardless of the manner of the request. This is outside the scope of the current dispute.

In any case, his statement is not explicit, contrary to the author’s claim.
And Allah knows best.

التعليق على النقل الثالث [24]**:** من الرد على البكري وفيه أنه اعتبر "سل الله لي" من جملة "كأمثاله من دعاء غير الله"، ثم قال الكاتب: "فجعل طلب الدعاء من الميت من صور دعاء غير الله، وهي من الشرك" ثم قال: "وقد نص على هذا في مختصر الفتاوى المصرية قائلا: "فمن جعل الملائكة أو غيرهم أربابا ووسائط يدعوهم ويتوكل عليهم..."، إلى أن قال عن المشايخ: "وإن أثبتها وسائط بمعنى الحجاب الذي بين الملك ورعيته بحيث يكونون هم يرفعون إلى الله حوائج خلقه فهذا شرك وكفر".

ومعلوم من كلام ابن تيمية وغيره أن ما وصفت به هذه الوسائط ينطبق على الشفاعة المنفية في كتاب الله، وهذا خارج محل النزاع.
ولا أجد لهذا تفسيرا إلا أن الكاتب يعتبر (طلب الدعاء من الميت) = (الشفاعة المنفية في القرآن)، حيث اعتبر كلام ابن تيمية بمرتبة "النص"، أي أنه لا يحتمل معنى آخر ولو ضعيفا غير ما احتج به الكاتب على من ردّ عليهم، ثم تبين لي لاحقا أنه يصرح بهذا عند النقل الخامس وفي خاتمة الكتاب.
وهو بهذا يجعل: (الدعاء) = (طلب الدعاء من الميت) = (الشفاعة المنفية في القرآن).
والله قد فرق بين الأول والأخير، وجعل الأخير أحد أسباب الأول، وذلك في قوله تعالى {قُلِ ادْعُوا الَّذِينَ زَعَمْتُم مِّن دُونِ اللَّهِ ۖ لَا يَمْلِكُونَ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَمَا لَهُمْ فِيهِمَا مِن شِرْكٍ وَمَا لَهُ مِنْهُم مِّن ظَهِيرٍ * وَلَا تَنفَعُ الشَّفَاعَةُ عِندَهُ إِلَّا لِمَنْ أَذِنَ لَهُ}، ولذا نجد ابن تيمية يجعل الأول من شرك الألوهية ـ وهذا معلوم عنه ـ، والأخير من شرك الربوبية، كما يفيده ظاهر قوله رحمه الله: "فالشفيع بغير إذن المشفوع إليه شريك له، والله تعالى لا شريك له، ولهذا قال {لَهُ مَا فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ مَنْ ذَا الَّذِي يَشْفَعُ عِنْدَهُ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِهِ}، فلو شفع أحد بغير إذنه شفاعة نافعة مقبولة كان شريكًا له" قاعدة عظيمة ص122-123، وكلامه في نفي الشريك عن الله بشفاعة الشفيع بغير إذنه سبحانه، فهو متعلق بذات الله وفعله، لا بفعل العابد، وهذا شرك في الربوبية لا في الألوهية [25]. بينما لا زم قول الكاتب أن ينسب لابن تيمية اعتبار جميع ذلك من شرك الألوهية، وهذا غلط عليه.

-

The commentary on the third transmission: from the response to al-Bakri, where he considered "Ask Allah for me" as part of "similar acts of supplicating to other than Allah." The author then stated: "He deemed requesting supplication from the deceased to be a form of supplication to other than Allah, which constitutes shirk (polytheism)." He continued, saying: "Ibn Taymiyyah explicitly mentioned this in the *Mukhtasar al-Fatawa al-Misriyyah*, stating: 'Whoever makes angels or others into lords or intermediaries, calling upon them and relying on them…,' until he said about the sheikhs: 'If he establishes them as intermediaries in the sense of veils between the king and his subjects, so that they are the ones who present the needs of His creation to Him, this is shirk and disbelief.'"

It is known from Ibn Taymiyyah's words and others that the description of these intermediaries applies to the intercession negated in the Book of Allah, which falls outside the area of contention.

I find no other explanation for this except that the author considers the request for supplication from the deceased to be the intercession negated in the Quran, treating Ibn Taymiyyah's words as conclusive ("nass"), meaning they do not allow for any other interpretation, even a weak one, besides what the author argued against those he opposed. Later, I realized he explicitly states this in the fifth transmission and in the book's conclusion.

Thus, he equates: **(supplication)** = **(requesting supplication from the deceased = the intercession negated in the Quran).** Allah, however, distinguished between the two, making the latter one of the causes of the former, as stated in His words: *"Say, 'Call upon those you claim [as gods] besides Allah. They do not possess an atom's weight in the heavens or on the earth, nor do they have any share in them, nor is there for Him among them any assistant. And intercession does not benefit with Him except for one whom He permits"* (Surah Saba: 22-23).

Hence, we find Ibn Taymiyyah categorizing the first as shirk in **uluhiyyah** (divinity)—which is well-known about him—and the latter as shirk in **rububiyyah** (lordship), as is evident from his statement: *"An intercessor without the permission of the one being interceded with is a partner to Him, but Allah has no partners. This is why He said, 'To Him belongs whatever is in the heavens and whatever is on*

the earth. Who is it that can intercede with Him except by His permission?' If someone interceded without His permission, and it resulted in effective, accepted intercession, that person would be a partner to Him." (*Qaidah Adheemah,* pp. 122-123).

His words in denying partners to Allah by the intercession of an intercessor without His permission relate to Allah's essence and actions, not to the worshiper's action. This is shirk in lordship, not in divinity. Meanwhile, the author's reasoning necessarily attributes to Ibn Taymiyyah the belief that all of this falls under shirk in divinity, which is an error concerning him.

وأما ما احتج به الكاتب من قول ابن تيمية في الرد على البكري، فجوابه في نفس الكتاب حيث قال في الرد على البكري: "حتى إنه إذا قدر أن الله تعالى يكلفهم بأعمال يعملونها بعد الموت لم يلزم من ذلك جواز دعائهم كما لا يجوز دعاء الملائكة و إن كان الله وكلهم بأعمال يعملونها لما في ذلك من الشرك والذريعة إلى الشرك " ص256-257 [ت:السهلي]، فجعل دعاء غير الله منه ما هو الشرك الأكبر ومنه ما هو ذريعة إليه، فالأول هو صريح الدعاء، والثاني هو سؤال الدعاء، فأنَّى يكون ما احتج به الكاتب صريحا على ما فهمه منه؟!!

ويشهد لورود عين هذا الوجه من الاستعمال لمسمى الدعاء على كلا المعنيين في آن واحد، كلام آخر لابن تيمية، مشكل غاية الإشكال على من لا يجمع النظير إلى نظيره من كلامه حتى يعرف عادته في ألفاظه، وهو قوله في قاعدة جليلة في التوسل والوسيلة ص52 -54 ـ وسأضع محل الإشكال وما يزيله من السياق وما سيتم توضيحه والتعليق عليه بين قوسين[ ] :-

"وَهَذَا وَنَحْوُهُ مِمَّا يُبَيِّنُ أَنَّ [الَّذِينَ يَدْعُونَ الْأَنْبِيَاءَ وَالصَّالِحِينَ بَعْدَ مَوْتِهِمْ عِنْدَ قُبُورِهِمْ وَغَيْرِ قُبُورِهِمْ]: هُمْ مِنْ الْمُشْرِكِينَ الَّذِينَ يَدْعُونَ غَيْرَ اللَّهِ كَالَّذِينَ يَدْعُونَ الْكَوَاكِبَ وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا الْمَلَائِكَةَ وَالنَّبِيِّينَ أَرْبَابًا قَالَ تَعَالَى {مَا كَانَ لِبَشَرٍ أَنْ يُؤْتِيَهُ اللَّهُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحُكْمَ وَالنُّبُوَّةَ ثُمَّ يَقُولَ لِلنَّاسِ كُونُوا عِبَادًا لِي مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ وَلَكِنْ كُونُوا رَبَّانِيِّينَ بِمَا كُنْتُمْ تُعَلِّمُونَ الْكِتَابَ وَبِمَا كُنْتُمْ تَدْرُسُونَ * وَلَا يَأْمُرَكُمْ أَنْ تَتَّخِذُوا الْمَلَائِكَةَ وَالنَّبِيِّينَ أَرْبَابًا أَيَأْمُرُكُمْ بِالْكُفْرِ بَعْدَ إذْ أَنْتُمْ مُسْلِمُونَ}، وَقَالَ تَعَالَى {قُلِ ادْعُوا الَّذِينَ زَعَمْتُمْ مِنْ دُونِهِ فَلَا يَمْلِكُونَ كَشْفَ الضُّرِّ عَنْكُمْ وَلَا تَحْوِيلًا * أُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ يَدْعُونَ يَبْتَغُونَ إلَى رَبِّهِمُ الْوَسِيلَةَ أَيُّهُمْ أَقْرَبُ وَيَرْجُونَ رَحْمَتَهُ وَيَخَافُونَ عَذَابَهُ إنَّ عَذَابَ رَبِّكَ كَانَ مَحْذُورًا}، وَقَالَ تَعَالَى {قُلِ ادْعُوا الَّذِينَ زَعَمْتُمْ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ لَا يَمْلِكُونَ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَمَا لَهُمْ فِيهِمَا مِنْ شِرْكٍ وَمَا لَهُ مِنْهُمْ مِنْ ظَهِيرٍ * وَلَا تَنْفَعُ الشَّفَاعَةُ عِنْدَهُ إلَّا لِمَنْ أَذِنَ لَهُ}، ومثل هذا كثير في القرآن [ينهى أن يُدعى غير الله لا من الملائكة ولا الأنبياء ولا غيرهم، فإن هذا شرك أو ذريعة إلى الشرك]. بخلاف [ما يطلب من أحدهم في حياته من الدعاء والشفاعة] فإنه لا يفضي إلى ذلك، فإن أحداً من الأنبياء والصالحين لم يُعبد في حياته بحضرته، فإنه ينهى من يفعل ذلك بخلاف [دعائهم بعد موتهم فإن ذلك ذريعة إلى الشرك بهم]، وكذلك [دعاؤهم في مغيبهم هو ذريعة إلى الشرك] . [فمن رأى نبياً أو ملكاً من الملائكة وقال له: "ادع لي" لم يفض ذلك إلى

\-

الشرك به، بخلاف من دعاه في مغيبه فإن ذلك يفضي إلى الشرك به] كما قد وقع، فإن الغائب والميت لا ينهى من يشرك، بل [إذا تعلقت القلوب بدعائه وشفاعته أفضى ذلك إلى الشرك به فدُعي] وقصد مكان قبره أو تمثاله أو غير ذلك، كما قد وقع فيه المشركون ومن ضاهاهم من أهل الكتاب [ومبتدعة المسلمين].... [فالملائكة يستغفرون للمؤمنين] من غير أن يسألهم أحد. [وكذلك ما روي أن النبي ﷺ أو غيره من الأنبياء والصالحين يدعو ويشفع للأخيار من أمته]، هو من هذا الجنس، هم يفعلون ما أذن الله لهم فيه [بدون سؤال أحد]. [وإذا لم يشرع دعاء الملائكة لم يشرع دعاء من مات من الأنبياء والصالحين، ولا أن نطلب منهم الدعاء والشفاعة وإن كانوا يدعون ويشفعون]، لوجهين:

أحدهما: أن ما أمر الله به من ذلك [هم يفعلونه وإن لم يطلب منهم]، وما لم يؤمروا به لا يفعلونه ولو طلب منهم، [فلا فائدة في الطلب منهم].

الثاني: أن [دعاءهم وطلب الشفاعة منهم في هذه الحال يفضي إلى الشرك] بهم ففيه هذه المفسدة، فلو قُدِّر أن فيه مصلحة لكانت هذه المفسدة راجحة، فكيف ولا مصلحة فيه" الفتاوى 1/ 178-179.

وقد راجعت عددا من الطبعات المختلفة وصيانة مجموع الفتاوى لناصر الفهد لأتثبت من عدم وقوع سقط أو تصحيف فلم أجد من ذا شيئا، ثم قد تبيّن لي بفضل الله وجهه وجواب ما يرد عليه من كلامه في مواطن أخرى من كتاباته، والحمد لله على تيسيره.

وموطن الإشكال الأبرز هو قوله: "يُدْعَى غَيْرُ اللَّهِ لَا مِنْ الْمَلَائِكَةِ وَلَا الْأَنْبِيَاءِ وَلَا غَيْرِهِمْ؛ فَإِنَّ هَذَا شِرْكٌ أَوْ ذَرِيعَةٌ إلَى الشِّرْكِ".

\-

As for the argument presented by the author from Ibn Taymiyyah's statement in his response to al-Bakri, the answer lies in the same book, where Ibn Taymiyyah says in his rebuttal:

"Even if it is assumed that Allah commands them (the deceased) to perform actions after death, this does not necessitate the permissibility of supplicating to them, just as it is not permissible to

supplicate to the angels, even though Allah has assigned them tasks, because this involves shirk (polytheism) or leads to it." (pp. 256–257, edited by al-Suhaili).

Thus, Ibn Taymiyyah categorized supplicating to beings other than Allah into two types:

1. **Major shirk** (explicit supplication).
2. **A means leading to shirk** (asking for supplication).

How, then, can the author's argument be conclusive based on the understanding he derived from Ibn Taymiyyah's words?

This dual use of the term *supplication* to refer to both meanings simultaneously is evident in other statements of Ibn Taymiyyah. However, understanding his words requires analyzing similar contexts in his writings to grasp his customary use of terminology. A particularly complex example is found in his *Qaidah Jalilah fi al-Tawassul wa al-Wasilah* (p. 54), where the critical points and their clarification are highlighted in parentheses:

- Ibn Taymiyyah says:
  "This and similar passages clarify that those who supplicate to the prophets and the righteous after their death, at their graves or elsewhere, are among the polytheists who supplicate to others besides Allah, just as those who supplicate to celestial bodies or those who take angels and prophets as lords."

He cites Quranic verses prohibiting supplication to others besides Allah:

- *"Say, 'Call upon those you claim [as gods] besides Him. They do not possess an atom's weight in the heavens or on the earth, nor do they have any share in either, and He does not have among them any assistant. Intercession does not benefit with Him except for one whom He permits."* (Saba: 22-23).

Ibn Taymiyyah continues:
"The Quran frequently forbids supplication to others besides Allah—neither angels, nor prophets, nor anyone else—as this constitutes shirk or leads to it. This differs from requesting supplication or intercession from someone during their lifetime, as that does not lead to shirk. None of the prophets or righteous individuals were worshiped in their lifetimes in their presence; rather, they forbade such acts."

He explains:
"However, invoking them after their death leads to shirk, as the deceased or absent cannot forbid those who associate them with Allah. When hearts become attached to supplicating or seeking intercession through them, it results in shirk. People may visit their graves, idols, or other representations, as has occurred among idolaters, People of the Book, and some Muslim innovators."

Ibn Taymiyyah concludes:
*"For this reason, it is not legislated to supplicate to angels, the deceased prophets, or the righteous, nor to request their supplication or intercession, even though they may supplicate or intercede for the believers by Allah's permission without being asked. This is because:

1. What Allah has commanded them to do, they perform without being asked, and what He has not commanded, they will not do even if requested. Thus, such requests are futile.

2. Supplicating to them or asking for intercession in this manner leads to shirk, outweighing any perceived benefit. In fact, there is no benefit, and the harm is evident."* (*Majmu' al-Fatawa,* vol. 1, pp. 178–179).

After reviewing multiple editions of *Majmu' al-Fatawa* and ensuring the accuracy of the texts without any omissions or errors, I found no discrepancies. By Allah's grace, I also understood Ibn Taymiyyah's perspective in light of his other writings. Praise be to Allah for facilitating this.

The main point of contention lies in his statement:
"Supplicating to others besides Allah—be it angels, prophets, or others—is either shirk or a means leading to shirk."

Footnote:

---

[24] وهو أطول التعليقات **وأهمها**.

[25] وكما يفيده أيضا ظاهر قول تلميذه العلامة ابن القيم رحمه الله في إغاثة اللهفان: "فالشفاعة بإذنه ليست شفاعة من دونه، ولا الشافع شفيع من دونه، بل شفيع بإذنه. والفرق بين الشفيعين، كالفرق بين الشريك والعبد المأمور. فالشفاعة التي أبطلها الله: شفاعة الشريك فإنه لا شريك له" ص220، وقوله في مدارج السالكين: "فقال تعالى {قل ادعوا الذين زعمتم من دون الله لا يملكون مثقال ذرة في السموات ولا في الأرض وما لهم فيهما من شرك وما له منهم من ظهير * ولا تنفع الشفاعة عنده إلا لمن أذن له}، فالمشرك إنما يتخذ معبوده لما يعتقد أنه يحصل له به من النفع، والنفع لا يكون إلا ممن فيه خصلة من هذه الأربع: إما مالك لما يريده عابده منه، فإن لم يكن مالكا كان شريكا للمالك، فإن لم يكن شريكا له كان معينا له وظهيرا، فإن لم يكن معينا ولا ظهيرا كان شفيعا عنده، فنفى سبحانه المراتب الأربع نفيا مترتبا متنقلا من الأعلى إلى ما دونه، فنفى الملك والشركة والمظاهرة والشفاعة التي يظنها المشرك، وأثبت شفاعة لا نصيب فيها لمشرك، وهي الشفاعة بإذنه، فكفى بهذه الآية نورا وبرهانا ونجاة وتجريدا للتوحيد وقطعا لأصول الشرك ومواده لمن عقلها" 1/ 343.

-

Translation:

This is the longest and most significant commentary.
It is also evidenced by the apparent statement of his student, the notable scholar Ibn Al-Qayyim (may Allah have mercy on him), in *Ighathat Al-Lahfan*:

> "Intercession by His permission is not intercession apart from Him, nor is the intercessor an intercessor apart from Him, but an intercessor by His permission. The difference between the two intercessions is like the difference between a partner and a commanded servant. The intercession that Allah nullified is the intercession of a partner, for He has no partner." (p. 220)

Similarly, in *Madarij Al-Salikin*, he said:

> *"Say, call upon those whom you claim besides Allah. They do not possess an atom's weight in the heavens or on the earth, nor do they have any share in either, nor is He supported by them. And intercession is of no benefit with Him except for those whom He permits."* (Quran 34:22-23)

The polytheist only takes his deity for what he believes he gains from it in terms of benefit. Such benefit can only come from someone who possesses one of these four characteristics:

1. Either ownership of what the worshipper desires.
2. If not ownership, then partnership with the owner.
3. If not partnership, then being an assistant or supporter of the owner.
4. If not an assistant or supporter, then interceding with the owner.

Allah (Glorified be He) has negated all four levels in a sequential manner, descending from the highest to the lowest:

- He negated ownership, partnership, assistance, and intercession that the polytheist assumes.
- He affirmed only one legitimate type of intercession, in which the polytheist has no share. This is intercession by His permission.

Ibn Al-Qayyim concludes:

> "This verse suffices as illumination, proof, salvation, and a purification of monotheism. It decisively cuts off the roots and causes of polytheism for those who understand it." (*Madarij Al-Salikin*, 1/343)

حيث جعل دعاء غير الله يحتمل أن يكون : شركا أو ذريعة إلى الشرك، فجعله يحتمل غير الشرك، أي الشرك الأصغر.
ومعلوم أن دعاء غير الله شرك أكبر بصريح الوحي والإجماع، الذي حكاه غير واحد ومنهم ابن تيمية.
والذي هو ذريعة إلى الشرك إنما هو سؤال الميت الدعاء عند قبره بشرط أن يكون خاليا من اعتقاد الشفاعة المنفية في القرآن، وعليه فموطن الإشكال من كلامه مراده منه ـ أي قوله : "يُدعى غير الله" ـ كل من صريح الدعاء وسؤال الدعاء، ويشهد لاستعمال الدعاء بمعنى سؤال الدعاء قوله: "دعائهم بعد موتهم فإن ذلك ذريعة إلى الشرك بهم"، المقابل لقوله قبلها: " ما يطلب من أحدهم في حياته من الدعاء والشفاعة فإنه لا يفضي إلى ذلك"،، ويؤكده قوله في آخر كلامه: "وإذا لم يشرع دعاء الملائكة لم يشرع دعاء من مات من الأنبياء والصالحين، ولا أن نطلب منهم الدعاء والشفاعة وإن كانوا يدعون"، فذكر كلا من صريح الدعاء وسؤال الدعاء.

وكلامه المشكل هذا يزول إشكاله إذا علمنا أنه أراد بالدعاء: مرة مجرد صريح الدعاء، ومرة أراد مجرد سؤال الميت الدعاء، ومرة أراد كلا المعنيين في آن واحد، والسياق والقرائن هي التي تحدد المراد، وأسوق كل صور الاستعمال للفظ (الدعاء) وما يتصرف عنه:

فقوله في أول كلامه: "الَّذِينَ يَدْعُونَ الْأَنْبِيَاءَ وَالصَّالِحِينَ بَعْدَ مَوْتِهِمْ عِنْدَ قُبُورِهِمْ وَغَيْرِ قُبُورِهِمْ...كَالَّذِينَ يَدْعُونَ الْكَوَاكِبَ وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا الْمَلَائِكَةَ وَالنَّبِيِّينَ أَرْبَابًا قَالَ تَعَالَى ..."، وقوله: "وإذا لم يشرع دعاء الملائكة لم يشرع دعاء من مات من الأنبياء والصالحين، ولا أن نطلب منهم الدعاء والشفاعة وإن كانوا يدعون"، مراده من جميع ذلك صريح الدعاء فحسب، الذي يعتبر صرفه لغير الله شركا أكبر.

وأما عن قوله: "دعائهم بعد موتهم فإن ذلك ذريعة إلى الشرك بهم، وكذلك دعاؤهم في مغيبهم هو ذريعة إلى الشرك . فمن رأى نبياً أو ملكاً من الملائكة وقال له: "ادع لي" لم يفض ذلك إلى الشرك به، بخلاف من دعاه في مغيبه فإن ذلك يفضي إلى الشرك به"، وقوله: "أن دعاءهم وطلب الشفاعة منهم في هذه الحال يفضي إلى الشرك"، فمراده من الدعاء ههنا سؤال الميت الدعاء.

وأما عن قوله: "ينهى أن يُدعى غير الله لا من الملائكة ولا الأنبياء ولا غيرهم، فإن هذا شرك أو ذريعة إلى الشرك"، فهو جامع لكلا معنيي الدعاء، أي صريح الدعاء وسؤال الميت الدعاء.

-

بينما قوله: " إذا تعلقت القلوب بدعائه وشفاعته أفضى ذلك إلى الشرك به فدُعي"، فالمراد من "بدعائه": سؤال الميت الدعاء، لأن تعلق القلب به مفض إلى الشرك، ولم يبلغ درجة الشرك الأكبر بعد، أما " فدُعي"، فالفاء هنا سببية في المعنى، فما قبلها سبب لما بعدها، فتكون من الشرك الذي أفضى إليه تعلق القلوب بما ذُكر.

وأنبه على أن قوله في الاستغاثة في الرد على البكري: "لما في ذلك من الشرك والذريعة إلى الشرك" ص257 [ت:السهلي]، مع قوله في موطن الإشكال الذي أجيب عنه: "فإن هذا شرك أو ذريعة إلى الشرك"، يدفع أي احتمال ـ قد يدعيه متحذلق ـ لأن يكون "الذريعة إلى الشرك" يتضمن الشرك الأكبر عند ابن تيمية، فيكون مراده على هذا الزعم غير الاستعمال المتعارف عليه لدى أهل العلم، من كونها تطلق فقط على ما دون الشرك الأكبر، لأن العطف يقتضي المغايرة.

-

The author clarifies Ibn Taymiyyah's nuanced use of the term *du'a* (supplication) in various contexts, explaining its potential meanings based on situational indicators. Ibn Taymiyyah distinguishes between explicit supplication (*sarih al-du'a*) and the request for supplication (*su'al al-du'a*), which could either constitute major shirk or serve as a pathway to it. The resolution of ambiguities in his writings relies on contextual and linguistic analysis. Key points include:

1. **Explicit Supplication (Sarih al-Du'a):**
   Ibn Taymiyyah unequivocally considers directing explicit acts of supplication to anyone other than Allah as major shirk, based on Quranic and scholarly consensus. For instance, when he says:
   “Those who supplicate to the prophets and the righteous after their death... are like those who supplicate to the celestial bodies or consider angels and prophets as lords.”
   In such cases, *du'a* refers solely to explicit invocation of beings other than Allah, which constitutes major shirk.

2. **Request for Supplication (Su'al al-Du'a):**
   When Ibn Taymiyyah addresses asking the deceased for supplication, such as in:
   “Their invocation after death leads to shirk, as does asking them while they are absent.”
   Here, *du'a* refers specifically to the act of requesting the deceased or absent beings for intercession or supplication. Ibn Taymiyyah views this as a *means leading to shirk* but distinguishes it from outright shirk if the act is devoid of beliefs invalidated by the Quran (e.g., associating divine intercession with the deceased).

3. **Both Meanings Combined:**
   In broader contexts, Ibn Taymiyyah sometimes uses *du'a* to encompass both explicit invocation and requests for supplication. For example, he states:
   “It is prohibited to supplicate to others besides Allah—be they angels, prophets, or others—because this is shirk or a means leading to shirk.”
   The conjunction “or” indicates that explicit invocation is major shirk, while requesting supplication could be a pathway leading to it.

4. **Key Clarifications:**

   - In cases where Ibn Taymiyyah discusses *tashbih* (attachment of the heart to a being’s supplication or intercession), he implies that such attachment could lead to shirk without yet reaching the threshold of major shirk. For instance:
     “If hearts become attached to their supplication or intercession, it leads to shirk.”
     Here, *attachment* to requesting supplication represents a prelude to outright shirk.

   - Ibn Taymiyyah’s distinction between shirk and a *means to shirk* aligns with scholarly conventions, which reserve *dhari'ah ila al-shirk* (a pathway to shirk) for acts below the threshold of major shirk. The differentiation is reinforced by Ibn Taymiyyah’s precise language:
     “Because it involves shirk and a means leading to shirk” (p. 257, edited by al-Suhaili).

5. **Conclusion on Contextual Usage:**

6. **24**
   Ibn Taymiyyah’s varied references to *du'a* demonstrate a reliance on the surrounding context to determine whether he is addressing explicit invocation, requests for intercession, or both. For instance:

   - *“The request for supplication leads to shirk”* refers to asking the deceased for intercession.
   - *“Supplication to others is shirk or a means to shirk”* includes both meanings, depending on context.

These distinctions clarify the apparent contradictions in Ibn Taymiyyah’s writings and align with broader theological principles that differentiate between acts constituting outright shirk and those serving as pathways to it.

ويَرد على ما سبق من بيان ثلاثة إشكالات، لن يستقيم المعنى إلا بالإجابة عنها:

فبالنسبة لموطن الإشكال الأول:
فإنه بعد أن ذكر صريح الآيات في الشرك الأكبر وصريح الدعاء لغير الله، قال بعدها مباشرة: "ومثل هذا كثير في القرآن ينهى أن يُدعى غير الله لا من الملائكة ولا الأنبياء ولا غيرهم، فإن هذا شرك أو ذريعة إلى الشرك"، والسؤال الذي يطرح نفسه: كيف ساغ له أن يستدل بما هو صريح في الشرك الأكبر على ما هو دونه مما هو ذريعة إليه؟ وجوابه: أن شواهد هذا كثيرة في الحديث والآثار وأقوال أهل العلم، ونص عليه الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب في موطنين من كتاب التوحيد، وليس هذا محل بسط ذلك [26]، وأشهر أمثلتها المتداولة بين أهل العلم والخطباء والوعاظ احتجاجهم بقوله تعالى {ومن أعرض عن ذكري فإن له معيشة ضنكا ونحشره يوم القيامة أعمى} الآيات [طه:124-127] على عصاة المسلمين، مع أن سياق الآية ورد في الكفار الذين سيخلدون في نار جهنم، نسأل الله العافية، ولا يخفى أن هذا لا يلزم منه تسوية ولا تكفير، ووجه الاستدلال بالنصوص التي في الكفار على المسلمين، أو التي في الكفر الأكبر على ما دونه، أن الكفر والشرك شعب، فمن أتى بما يخرج من الملة مما يأتي به الكفار أخذ حكمهم، ومن أتى بشعبة منه وخصلة منه مما لا يخرج من الملة، أخذ بعض حكمهم لا كله، وهو الكفر الأصغر والشرك الأصغر، ولحقه من الوعيد بقدر ذلك، فدخل بهذا في حكم هذه الآيات دخولا جزئيا لا دخولا كلّيا، والذي ذم من أجله الخوارج إنما هو التسوية بين الجميع ولو اختلفت درجاتها ومراتبها، والحكم على جميعها بأنها مخرجة من الملة، وذلك لأن الكفر والشرك عندهم شعبة واحدة لا يتجزأ [27]، وبهذا الاعتبار صح الاحتجاج عند أهل السنة بالآيات التي في الشرك الأكبر ـ ومن ذلك صريح الدعاء لغير الله ـ على النهي عن الشرك الأصغر ـ ومنه سؤال الدعاء عند القبر ـ [28].

أما عن موطن الإشكال الثاني:
فقوله عن دعاء الحي الغائب: "وكذلك دعاؤهم في مغيبهم هو ذريعة إلى الشرك. فمن رأى نبياً أو ملكاً من الملائكة وقال له: "ادع لي" لم يفض ذلك إلى الشرك به، بخلاف من دعاه في مغيبه فإن ذلك يفضي إلى الشرك به كما قد وقع، فإن الغائب والميت لا ينهى من يشرك"، حيث جعل دعاء الغائب ("دعاؤهم في مغيبهم") هو الآخر ذريعة إلى الشرك، أي أنه ليس بشرك أكبر، وهذا يعني كذلك: أنه لا يستلزم أن يكون سائل الغائب معتقدا فيه أنه قد أحاط سمعه وعلمه بكل من سأله ولو كان غائبا، الذي هو شرك في الصفات، إلا أنه يفضي إليه كما هو معتقد غلاة الصوفية في أوليائهم.
وجواب هذا الإشكال من وجهين:

-

الوجه الأول: أن يقال في هذا ما قيل في دعاء الميت، من كون مراده منه سؤال الغائب الدعاء، وسياق الكلام يدل على ذلك، أي قوله: "فمن رأى نبياً أو ملكاً من الملائكة وقال له: "ادع لي" لم يفض ذلك إلى الشرك به، بخلاف من دعاه في مغيبه فإن ذلك يفضي إلى الشرك به"، حيث جعل: "بخلاف من دعاه في مغيبه"، مقابلا لـ"فمن رأى نبياً....وقال له: ادع لي"، بخلاف صريح الدعاء للغائب فإنه قد قال فيه في موطن آخر: "وَقَدْ ذَكَرَ عُلَمَاءُ الْإِسْلَامِ وَأَئِمَّةُ الدِّينِ الْأَدْعِيَةَ الشَّرْعِيَّةَ وَأَعْرَضُوا عَنْ الْأَدْعِيَةِ الْبِدْعِيَّةِ فَيَنْبَغِي اتِّبَاعُ ذَلِكَ. وَالْمَرَاتِبُ فِي هَذَا الْبَابِ ثَلَاثٌ: ـ إحْدَاهَا أَنْ يَدْعُوَ غَيْرَ اللَّهِ وَهُوَ مَيِّتٌ أَوْ غَائِبٌ سَوَاءٌ كَانَ مِنْ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ وَالصَّالِحِينَ أَوْ غَيْرِهِمْ فَيَقُولُ: يَا سَيِّدِي فُلَانٌ أَغِثْنِي أَوْ أَنَا أَسْتَجِيرُ بِك أَوْ أَسْتَغِيثُ بِك أَوْ أَنْصُرْنِي عَلَى عَدُوِّي. وَنَحْوُ ذَلِكَ فَهَذَا هُوَ الشِّرْكُ بِاَللَّهِ" الفتاوى 1/ 350.

-

The above raises three issues that cannot be resolved without addressing them:

Regarding the first point of contention:
After explicitly mentioning verses about major shirk (polytheism) and calling upon other than Allah, he immediately states:

> "And such examples are numerous in the Quran, which prohibits calling upon anyone other than Allah, whether angels, prophets, or others, for this is either shirk or a means leading to shirk."

The question arises: How could he use what is explicit about major shirk as evidence for something lesser, which is only a means leading to shirk?
The answer: This has many precedents in hadith, traditions, and the statements of scholars, explicitly mentioned by Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab in two places in *Kitab Al-Tawhid*. This is not the place to elaborate on them. One famous example among scholars, preachers, and orators is their citing the verse:

> *"And whoever turns away from My remembrance – indeed, he will have a depressed life, and We will gather him on the Day of Resurrection blind."* (*Taha: 124-127*).

Although the context of the verse refers to disbelievers who will eternally dwell in Hell, scholars still use it concerning sinful Muslims.
This does not entail equivalence or takfir (declaring someone a disbeliever).

The reasoning for using texts about disbelievers for Muslims, or those about major disbelief for something lesser, lies in the fact that disbelief and shirk have branches. Whoever commits acts that expel them from the fold of Islam shares the ruling with disbelievers.
However, if one commits a branch or portion of disbelief or shirk that does not expel them from Islam, they take a partial share of the ruling—not the whole.
Such acts are classified as minor disbelief or minor shirk, and the individual is subject to a degree of punishment commensurate with that act.

Thus, they partially fall under these verses, not wholly. What the Khawarij were criticized for was their equal treatment of all cases, regardless of degrees or ranks, and their declaration that all such acts remove one from Islam.

For the Khawarij, disbelief and shirk are seen as a single, indivisible entity.
Accordingly, it is valid for the people of Sunnah to use verses about major shirk—such as calling upon other than Allah—to prohibit minor shirk, including asking for supplication at graves.

Regarding the second point of contention:
In his statement about calling upon the absent:

> "Similarly, calling upon them in their absence is a means leading to shirk. Whoever sees a prophet or angel and says to them, 'Pray for me,' this does not lead to shirk concerning them, unlike calling upon them in their absence, which leads to shirk concerning them, as has happened. For the absent or deceased cannot prevent those who associate others with Allah."

Here, he made calling upon the absent ("calling upon them in their absence") another means to shirk, meaning it is not major shirk itself. This also implies that the one asking the absent person does not necessarily believe they encompass all who ask them in hearing and knowledge, which would constitute shirk in Allah's attributes.

Instead, this act leads to such beliefs, as is the case with the extremist Sufis and their belief in their saints.

The response to this issue is twofold:

1. **First:** It may be said regarding this as has been said about calling upon the dead: that his intention here is asking the absent to pray, as the context of his words suggests. He states:

> "Whoever sees a prophet or angel and says, 'Pray for me,' this does not lead to shirk concerning them, unlike calling upon them in their absence, which leads to shirk concerning them."

He juxtaposes "unlike" with "whoever sees a prophet… and says, 'Pray for me.'"

As for explicitly calling upon the absent, he said elsewhere:

> "The scholars of Islam and the imams of the religion have mentioned legitimate supplications and refrained from innovative ones, and it is appropriate to follow that. There are three ranks in this regard:
>
> The first is to call upon other than Allah while they are dead or absent, whether they are prophets, righteous people, or others. This includes saying, 'O master so-and-so,

help me,' or 'I seek refuge in you,' or 'Save me,' or 'Support me against my enemy,' and the like. This is shirk with Allah." (*Fatawa*, 1/350).

Footnote:

---

[26] وقد جمع منها قدرا لا بأس به إبراهيم السكران في كتابه مآلات الخطاب المدني ص167-171، وفاتته شواهد، ومما أورده قول ابن تيمية - بعد ذكره لقوله تعالى {وَمَثَلُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا كَمَثَلِ الَّذِي يَنْعِقُ بِمَا لَا يَسْمَعُ إِلَّا دُعَاءً وَنِدَاءً}، وقوله {أَمْ تَحْسَبُ أَنَّ أَكْثَرَهُمْ يَسْمَعُونَ أَوْ يَعْقِلُونَ إِنْ هُمْ إِلَّا كَالْأَنْعَامِ بَلْ هُمْ أَضَلُّ سَبِيلًا}، وقوله {وَلَقَدْ ذَرَأْنَا لِجَهَنَّمَ كَثِيرًا مِنَ الْجِنِّ وَالْإِنْسِ لَهُمْ قُلُوبٌ لَا يَفْقَهُونَ بِهَا وَلَهُمْ أَعْيُنٌ لَا يُبْصِرُونَ بِهَا وَلَهُمْ آذَانٌ لَا يَسْمَعُونَ بِهَا أُولَئِكَ كَالْأَنْعَامِ بَلْ هُمْ أَضَلُّ} -: "فَطَائِفَةٌ مِنْ الْمُفَسِّرِينَ تَقُولُ فِي هَذِهِ الْآيَاتِ وَمَا أَشْبَهَهَا كَقَوْلِهِ {وَإِذَا مَسَّ الْإِنْسَانَ الضُّرُّ دَعَانَا لِجَنْبِهِ أَوْ قَاعِدًا أَوْ قَائِمًا فَلَمَّا كَشَفْنَا عَنْهُ ضُرَّهُ مَرَّ كَأَنْ لَمْ يَدْعُنَا إِلَى ضُرٍّ مَسَّهُ}، وَأَمْثَالُهَا مِمَّا ذَكَرَ اللهُ فِي عُيُوبِ الْإِنْسَانِ وَذَمِّهَا فَيَقُولُ هَؤُلَاءِ: هَذِهِ الْآيَةُ فِي الْكُفَّارِ وَالْمُرَادُ بِالْإِنْسَانِ هُنَا الْكَافِرُ، فَيَبْقَى مَنْ يَسْمَعُ ذَلِكَ يَظُنُّ أَنَّهُ لَيْسَ لِمَنْ يُظْهِرُ الْإِسْلَامَ فِي هَذَا الذَّمِّ وَالْوَعِيدِ نَصِيبٌ" الفتاوى 10/104-105.

[27] ولما كان المرجئة يلتقون في هذا الأصل مع الخوارج، عكس غلاتهم الأمر ومنعوا مطلقا من إلحاق المسلم بهذا النوع من الآيات، أيا كان وجه الإلحاق، إلا من اعتقد ما يسلمون بكون اعتقاده كفرا أكبر، وهذا من آثار فساد أصولهم العقدية في بابي الإيمان والكفر.

[28] ومن هذا القبيل قول شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية: "عن ابن عمر رضي الله عنهما قال: قال رسول الله ﷺ: "من تشبه بقوم فهو منهم"، وهذا إسناد جيد.... وهذا الحديث أقل أحواله أن يقتضي تحريم التشبه بهم، وإن كان ظاهره يقتضي كفر المتشبه بهم كما في قوله {وَمَنْ يَتَوَلَّهُمْ مِنْكُمْ فَإِنَّهُ مِنْهُمْ} [المائدة:51]" اقتضاء الصراط المستقيم 1/ 269-270، وقوله:"ولما كان للمشركين شجرة يعلقون عليها أسلحتهم، ويسمونها ذات أنواط، فقال بعض الناس: يا رسول الله اجعل لنا ذات أنواط، كما لهم ذات أنواط. فقال: "الله أكبر، قلتم كما قال قوم موسى {اجعل لنا إلها كما لهم آلهة}، إنها السنن لتركبن سنن من كان قبلكم". فأنكر النبي ﷺ مجرد مشابهتهم للكفار في اتخاذ شجرة يعكفون عليها، معلقين عليها سلاحهم" اقتضاء الصراط المستقيم 2/ 157.

-

26

Ibrahim Al-Sakran compiled a considerable amount of this in his book *The Outcomes of Civil Discourse* (pp. 167–171), though he missed certain examples. Among the citations he included was the statement of Ibn Taymiyyah, after mentioning Allah's words:

> *"The example of those who disbelieve is like that of one who shouts at what hears nothing but calls and cries"* (*Al-Baqarah: 171*),
> *"Do you think that most of them hear or reason? They are like cattle; rather, they are even more astray in way"* (*Al-Furqan: 44*),
> and:
> *"And We have certainly created for Hell many of the jinn and mankind. They have hearts with which they do not understand, eyes with which they do not see, and ears with which they do not hear. Those are like livestock; rather, they are more astray. It is they who are the heedless"* (*Al-A'raf: 179*).

He then states:

> "A group of interpreters say about these verses and those similar to them, such as: *'When adversity touches man, he calls upon Us, lying on his side or sitting or standing. But when We remove his adversity from him, he continues as if he had never called upon Us to remove an adversity that touched him'* (*Yunus: 12*)—and others, where Allah mentions the flaws and blameworthiness of mankind—that these verses are directed at the disbelievers, and the 'man' referenced here is the disbeliever. As a result, those who hear such interpretations might assume that these warnings and reproaches do not apply to anyone who outwardly shows Islam." (*Majmu' al-Fatawa*, 10/104–105).

27

Since the Murji'ah align with the Khawarij in this principle—though in reverse—their extremists inverted the matter entirely. They categorically prohibited applying this type of verse to a Muslim, regardless of the context, unless the individual explicitly held beliefs that they agreed constituted major disbelief. This stems from the corruption of their theological foundations regarding the concepts of faith and disbelief.

An example of this is Sheikh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah's statement:

> “On the authority of Ibn Umar (may Allah be pleased with them both), the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) said: ‘Whoever imitates a people is one of them.’ This narration has a good chain... At the very least, this hadith implies that imitating them is forbidden, even though its apparent meaning suggests that imitating them constitutes disbelief, as in Allah’s statement: *‘And whoever is an ally to them among you—then indeed, he is one of them’* (*Al-Ma'idah: 51*).” (*Iqtidā’ al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm*, pp. 270–271).

He also said:

> “When the polytheists had a tree to which they would hang their weapons and dedicate themselves, calling it *Dhat Anwat*, some people said, ‘O Messenger of Allah, make for us a *Dhat Anwat* like theirs.’ The Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) replied: ‘Allahu Akbar! You have said what the people of Moses said: *Make for us a god just as they have gods.* These are the traditions; you will certainly follow the ways of those who came before you.’”

The Prophet disapproved of even their mere resemblance to the disbelievers by adopting a tree to which they would dedicate themselves and hang their weapons. (*Iqtidā’ al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm*, 2/157).

-

الوجه الثاني: متعلق بكون سؤال الحي الغائب الدعاء لا يستلزم الشرك في الصفات، وإنما هو مفض إليه، وهذا يوضحه ما ذكره ابن تيمية في الرد على الأخنائي، حيث قال ردا على من غلا في النبي ﷺ بعد وفاته: "وقول القائل: إنه يسمع الصلاة من البعيد ممتنع، فإنه إن أراد وصول صوت المصلّي إليه فهذه مكابرة، وإن أراد أنه هو يكون بحيث يسمع أصوات الخلائق من بعيد، فليس هذا إلا لله رب العالمين الذي يسمع أصوات العباد كلهم.... وليس أحد من البشر بل ولا من الخلق يسمع أصوات العباد كلهم، ومن قال هذا في بشر فقوله من جنس قول النصارى الذين يقولون إن المسيح هو الله، وإنه يعلم ما يفعله العباد ويسمع أصواتهم ويجيب دعاءهم" ص146-147 [ت:زهوي] وص348-349 [ت:العنزي]، وهو ما نقله ابن عبد الهادي في الصارم المنكي ص161 [ت:المقطري]، ففرق رحمه الله بين القول بـ"وصول صوت المصلي إليه"، وبين القول بأنه "يسمع أصوات الخلائق من بعيد"، وهو بمعنى: "يسمع أصوات العباد كلهم"، واعتبر الأول "مكابرة"، بينما حكم على الثاني بكونه "من جنس قول النصارى الذين يقولون إن المسيح هو الله، وإنه يعلم ما يفعله العباد ويسمع أصواتهم ويجيب دعاءهم"، وذلك أن الغلو في القول الأول: مقيد جزئي، وهذا هو الذي "يفضي إلى الشرك"، بخلاف الغلو في القول الثاني: فإنه مطلق كلي، وهذا بذاته شرك أكبر ولو لم يدع. وبهذا يظهر أن إطلاق الشيخ بكر أبو زيد المفيد لكون من سأل الميت الدعاء بعيدا عن قبره مستلزما لشرك الصفات فيه نظر. وأما عن اعتقاد غلاة الصوفية أن الله أقدر النبي والولي على سماع جميع أصوات العباد، فهذا من جنس قول مشركي العرب في التلبية: "لبيك اللهم لبيك، لبيك لا شريك لك لبيك، إلا شريكا هو لك، تملكه وما ملك"، واعتقاد الإذن الإلهي لا يخرجه عن كونه شركا أكبر.

-

وأما عن موطن الإشكال الثالث: فهو قوله في قاعدة جليلة: "بل إذا تعلقت القلوب بدعائه وشفاعته أفضى ذلك إلى الشرك به فدُعي وقصد مكان قبره أو تمثاله أو غير ذلك، كما قد وقع فيه المشركون ومن ضاهاهم من أهل الكتاب ومبتدعة المسلمين"، فقد سبق أن بيّنا أن مراده من "فدُعي" صريح الدعاء، لدلالة السياق، وعليه يكون ابن تيمية قد نسب الشرك الأكبر لـ"مبتدعة المسلمين"، وهذا ضرب من التناقض عند من حرف مذهب ابن تيمية في مسألة العذر بالجهل لمن وقع في الشرك قبل التمكن من الحجة الرسالية [29]، وإبطالا لهذا الوهم أنقل كلامه في خمسة مواطن مختلفة، ثلاثة منها في نفس المصدر ـ أي قاعدة جليلة في التوسل والوسيلة ـ، حيث قال رحمه الله: "أَنَّهُ يُرَادُ بِذَلِكَ نَفْيُ الشَّفَاعَةِ الَّتِي يُثْبِتُهَا أَهْلُ الشِّرْكِ وَمَنْ شَابَهَهُمْ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْبِدَعِ: مِنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ وَالْمُسْلِمِينَ الَّذِينَ يَظُنُّونَ أَنَّ لِلْخَلْقِ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ مِنْ الْقَدْرِ أَنْ يَشْفَعُوا عِنْدَهُ بِغَيْرِ إذْنِهِ كَمَا يَشْفَعُ النَّاسُ بَعْضُهُمْ عِنْدَ بَعْضٍ فَيَقْبَلُ الْمَشْفُوعُ إلَيْهِ شَفَاعَةَ شَافِعٍ لِحَاجَتِهِ إلَيْهِ رَغْبَةً وَرَهْبَةً وَكَمَا يُعَامِلُ الْمَخْلُوقُ الْمَخْلُوقَ بِالْمُعَاوَضَةِ"، وقال أيضا: "فَهَذِهِ الْأَنْوَاعُ مِنْ خِطَابِ الْمَلَائِكَةِ وَالْأَنْبِيَاءِ وَالصَّالِحِينَ بَعْدَ مَوْتِهِمْ عِنْدَ قُبُورِهِمْ وَفِي مَغِيبِهِمْ وَخِطَابِ تَمَاثِيلِهِمْ هُوَ مِنْ أَعْظَمِ أَنْوَاعِ الشِّرْكِ الْمَوْجُودِ فِي الْمُشْرِكِينَ مِنْ غَيْرِ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ وَفِي مُبْتَدِعَةِ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ وَالْمُسْلِمِينَ الَّذِينَ أَحْدَثُوا مِن الشِّرْكِ وَالْعِبَادَاتِ مَا لَمْ يَأْذَنْ بِهِ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى. قَالَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى {أَمْ لَهُمْ شُرَكَاءُ شَرَعُوا لَهُمْ مِنَ الدِّينِ مَا لَمْ يَأْذَنْ بِهِ اللَّهُ}. فَإِنَّ دُعَاءَ الْمَلَائِكَةِ وَالْأَنْبِيَاءِ بَعْدَ مَوْتِهِمْ وَفِي مَغِيبِهِمْ وَسُؤَالَهُمْ وَالِاسْتِغَاثَةَ بِهِمْ وَالِاسْتِشْفَاعَ بِهِمْ فِي هَذِهِ الْحَالِ وَنَصْبَ تَمَاثِيلِهِمْ - بِمَعْنَى طَلَبِ الشَّفَاعَةِ مِنْهُمْ - هُوَ مِن الدِّينِ الَّذِي لَمْ يَشْرَعْهُ اللَّهُ"، وقال أيضا: "فَالشَّفَاعَةُ نَوْعَانِ: أَحَدُهُمَا: الشَّفَاعَةُ الَّتِي نَفَاهَا اللَّهُ تَعَالَى كَالَّتِي أَثْبَتَهَا الْمُشْرِكُونَ وَمَنْ ضَاهَاهُمْ مِنْ جُهَّالِ هَذِهِ الْأُمَّةِ وَضُلَّالِهِمْ وَهِيَ شِرْكٌ. وَالثَّانِي: أَنْ يَشْفَعَ الشَّفِيعُ بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ..." الفتاوى 1/149-150 و159-160 و332، فنسب الشرك الأكبر لجهال هذه الأمة من مبتدعة المسلمين في المواطن الثلاثة.

-

وتكرر ذلك في موطنين آخرين: في قوله: "وَقِسْمٌ ثَانٍ غَلَوْا فِي الْأَنْبِيَاءِ وَالصَّالِحِينَ وَفِي الْمَلَائِكَةِ أَيْضًا، فَجَعَلُوهُمْ وَسَائِطَ فِي الْعِبَادَةِ فَعَبَدُوهُمْ لِيُقَرِّبُوهُمْ إلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَى وَصَوَّرُوا تَمَاثِيلَهُمْ وَعَكَفُوا عَلَى قُبُورِهِمْ، وَهَذَا كَثِيرٌ فِي النَّصَارَى وَمَنْ ضَاهَاهُمْ مِنْ ضُلَّالِ أَهْلِ الْقِبْلَةِ" الفتاوى 283/27، وفي اقتضاء الصراط المستقيم، حيث قال عند حديثه عن اختلاف الناس في الشفاعة: "وهذا الموضع افترق الناس فيه ثلاث فرق: طرفان ووسط. فالمشركون ومن وافقهم من مبتدعة أهل الكتاب كالنصارى ومبتدعة هذه الأمة، أثبتوا الشفاعة التي نفاها القرآن. والخوارج والمعتزلة أنكروا شفاعة نبينا ﷺ في أهل الكبائر من أمته" 360-359/2 [ت: ناصر العقل] و ص443 [ت: محمد حامد الفقي، ط. دار الفكر].

وأما عن مسألة إطلاقه اسم المشرك قبل بلوغ الحجة، فهذا يفسر على ضوء السياق الذي ذكر فيه أصل المسألة، فقد ذكر هذه المسألة في سياق تقرير الصواب في أصل التحسين والتقبيح العقليّين، والرد على المعتزلة والأشاعرة، وقد فسرها من حرف مراده منها على وجه يوافق أصول المعتزلة، لا وفق ما قرره ابن تيمية، وليس هذا محل بسطه[30]، ولا شك في أن معرفة قول الأشاعرة والمعتزلة المردود عليهم يعين على فهم كلامه على وجهه الذي أراده.

-

Prayer (Salāh)

The Second Aspect: This concerns the notion that asking a living but absent person for supplication does not inherently constitute polytheism in attributes (*shirk fī al-ṣifāt*), though it leads to it. This is clarified by what Ibn Taymiyyah stated in his refutation of al-Akhnā'ī, where he responded to those who exaggerated in their veneration of the Prophet after his death. He said:

> "The claim that the Prophet hears from afar is untenable. If it is meant that the prayer of the one praying reaches him, this is absurd. If it is meant that he himself is in a state where he hears the voices of creatures from afar, then this applies only to Allah, the Lord of all worlds, who hears the voices of all His servants… None among humans or any creation hears the voices of all worshipers. Whoever attributes this to a human is akin to the Christians who claim that Christ is God, that he knows the deeds of worshipers, hears their voices, and responds to their supplications."
> (*Al-Radd ʿalā al-Akhnāʾī*, pp. 146–147 [ed. Zahwī]; pp. 348–349 [ed. al-ʿAnazī]).

Ibn al-Hādī also recorded this in *Al-Ṣārim al-Mankī*, p. 161 [ed. al-Maqṭarī]. Ibn Taymiyyah made a distinction between:

1. The claim that the voice of the one praying reaches him, which he considered absurd.
2. The claim that he hears all the voices of worshipers from afar, which is analogous to the Christians' attribution of divinity to Christ.

This exaggeration in the first claim is partial and restricted, which leads to *shirk* indirectly. However, exaggeration in the second claim is absolute and comprehensive, constituting major polytheism (*shirk akbar*) in itself, even without direct invocation.

From this, it becomes clear that Sheikh Bakr Abu Zayd's generalization that asking the deceased for supplication from afar constitutes *shirk fī al-ṣifāt* is debatable. As for the belief of extremist Sufis that Allah empowered the Prophet or saints to hear the voices of all worshipers, it aligns with the Arabs' polytheistic proclamation in the talbiyah:

> "Here I am, O Allah, here I am. You have no partner except a partner You own, and all that he owns."

Attributing divine permission to this claim does not exempt it from being major polytheism.

The Third Point of Contention
Ibn Taymiyyah stated in *Qāʿida Jalīla*:

> "If hearts become attached to invoking him and seeking his intercession, this leads to polytheism. Thus, he is invoked, and people direct themselves to his grave, statue, or

other representations, as happened with the polytheists and those who resemble them from the People of the Book and the innovators among Muslims."

We previously explained that by "he is invoked," Ibn Taymiyyah explicitly referred to direct invocation, as the context indicates. Consequently, he attributed major polytheism to the "innovators among Muslims." This presents a contradiction for those who distort Ibn Taymiyyah's stance on excusing ignorance for those who commit *shirk* without prior exposure to the message of Islam.

To refute this misinterpretation, we cite his statements from five different contexts, three of which are from the same source (*Qāʿida Jalīla fī al-Tawassul wa al-Wasīla*):

1. "This refers to negating intercession as understood by the polytheists and those who resemble them from the People of the Book and the innovators among Muslims, who assume that creation holds a position before Allah enabling them to intercede without His permission, similar to how humans intercede for one another due to mutual needs and dependencies."
2. "These acts of addressing angels, prophets, and the righteous after their deaths, at their graves, or in their absence—speaking to their statues—constitute among the greatest forms of *shirk* practiced by the polytheists, non-Muslims, and the innovators among the People of the Book and Muslims who introduced practices not sanctioned by Allah. Allah says:

   'Or do they have partners who have ordained for them a religion to which Allah has not consented?' (*Al-Shura: 21*).
   Invoking angels, prophets, and others after their deaths or in their absence, seeking their aid or intercession, and erecting statues to venerate them with the intention of seeking intercession are forms of religion not prescribed by Allah."

3. "Intercession is of two types:
   - The intercession Allah negates, which the polytheists and some ignorant individuals of this *ummah* affirm. This constitutes *shirk*.
   - The intercession granted by Allah's permission…"
     (*Majmuʿ al-Fatāwā*, 1/149–150; 1/159–160; 1/332).

<u>Translator's note: When Ibn Taymiyyah says "individuals of this Ummah" he refers to the Ummah of Da'wah (those whom the call of Islam reached) not the Ummah of Ijabah (those who responded to the call) basically those who claim to be from this Ummah, for other statements from Ibn Taymiyyah explicitly denying excuse of ignorance in Major Shirk refer to Shaykh Abd al Rahman ibn Hasan Aal Ash Shaykh's book on the matter https://darultawhid.com/tr/dosyalar/risale/excuse_ignorance_muayyan_takfir_abdurrahman_bin_hasan.pdf</u>

This concept appears in two additional instances, where Ibn Taymiyyah stated:

> "The second group exaggerated in their veneration of prophets, the righteous, and even the angels, making them intermediaries in worship. They worshiped them to bring themselves closer to Allah, depicted their images, and devoted themselves to their graves. This is prevalent among Christians and those resembling them from the misguided members of the Muslim *qiblah* community."
> (*Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 27/283).

It is also found in *Iqtida' al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm*, where he discusses differing views on intercession:

> “On this matter, people have divided into three groups: two extremes and one middle path. The polytheists and those among the innovators from the People of the Book, like the Christians and certain innovators in this *ummah*, affirmed the type of intercession negated by the Qur'an. The Khawārij and Muʿtazilah denied the intercession of our Prophet for the major sinners of his *ummah*.”
> (*Iqtida' al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm*, 2/359–360 [ed. Nāṣir al-ʿAql]; p. 443 [ed. Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Fiqī, Dār al-Fikr edition]).

On the Designation of Someone as a Polytheist Before the Evidence Reaches Them

Ibn Taymiyyah’s statements regarding the attribution of polytheism (*shirk*) prior to the establishment of proof (*bulūgh al-ḥujjah*) must be interpreted in the context of his discussion of the foundational principle of rational discernment of good and evil (*taḥsīn wa-taqbīḥ ʿaqlī*). This was presented as a rebuttal to the views of the Muʿtazilah and Ashʿarīs.

However, his words have been distorted by some to align with the Muʿtazilite principles he opposed. Understanding the broader context of his critique of the Ashʿarīs and Muʿtazilah, as well as his general theological methodology, clarifies his actual position. This discussion lies outside the scope of the current summary.

Undoubtedly, familiarity with the positions of the Ashʿarīs and Muʿtazilah, and the context in which Ibn Taymiyyah refuted them, is critical for accurately grasping his intended meaning.

> وبمجموع هذا البيان اتضح لنا أن ابن تيمية يطلق مسمى الدعاء على كل من (صريح الدعاء) و(طلب الدعاء)، وأنه مع ذلك لا يسوي بينهما في الحكم، لا كما يزعم الكاتب من كونه يعتبر كليهما شركا أكبر، وأن ذلك من صريح كلامه!!
>
> وأيا كان فليس بمثل ذلك الكلام المجمل الذي نقله عن ابن تيمية تقرر مذاهب أهل العلم، إلا أن يأتي بما يفسره من كلامه.

-

In summary, this statement makes it clear to us that Ibn Taymiyyah applies the term "supplication" to both explicit supplication and the request for supplication. However, he does not equate them in ruling, contrary to the claim of the writer, who alleges that he considers both as major shirk, asserting this as an explicit statement of his! In any case, such general speech as the writer attributes to Ibn Taymiyyah is not sufficient to establish the positions of the scholars unless accompanied by clarifying statements from his own words.

-

[29] ممن يقر بلزوم عبادة الله وحده، وسبب وقوعه في الشرك جهله بأن حقيقة فعله عبادة صرفها لغير الله تعالى.

[30] وقد بسطت المسألة في كتاب كشف الالتباس ص121-126 و376-399 و444، ومن أراد الاختصار فليراجع مجموع الفتاوى 20/ 38-39، هذا إن كانت له معرفة بقول المعتزلة والأشاعرة في مسألة التحسين والتقبيح العقليين، مع الرد على الأخنائي ص91-92 وص218 [ت:زهوي]، عند حديثه عن "هذا المعترض وأمثاله" في كلا الموطنين، حيث سماهم مرة مسلمين ومرة مشركين، ومراده بالأخير الوصف ذما لهم وتقبيحا عقليا لما هم عليه من الشرك (خلافا لمقتضى أصل الأشاعرة في مسألة التحسين والتقبيح)، وهذا هو مراد ابن تيمية بثبوت الاسم قبل بلوغ الحجة، لا الحكم عليهم بنفي الإسلام عنهم - وسياق كلامه واضح الدلالة على ذلك - (خلافا لمقتضى أصل المعتزلة في مسألة التحسين والتقبيح)، وذلك لوجود المانع، وهو عدم التمكن من الحجة الرسالية، إذ السبب - وهو الناقض هنا - لا يؤثر في وجود الحكم مع وجود مانعه =

-

= (خلافا للأشاعرة الذين جعلوا الحكم يوجد عند السبب لا به، وجعلوا المانع رافعا للحكم، طردا لقولهم ـ في باب القدر ـ بنفي تأثير الأسباب الكونية، على الأحكام الوضعية في علم أصول الفقه، فجعلوا السبب والشرط والمانع مجرد أمارات لا تأثير لها في وجود الحكم التكليفي من عدمه، ومراد من ذكر منهم التأثير في هذا الباب المعنى المجازي لا المعنى الحقيقي الواقع بإذن الله)، ومن جعل مراد ابن تيمية بـ"ثبوت الاسم قبل بلوغ الحجة"، هو ثبوت الحكم الشرعي فيهم، فقد أجرى كلامه على أصول المعتزلة، لكونه قال ذلك في سياق الحديث عن أصل التحسين والتقبيح العقليين والرد على المعتزلة والأشاعرة، وذلك أن المعنى الشرعي لأصل مسمى الشرك وما تصرف عنه ثابت في لسان العرب قبل مجيء الرسالة، كما هو الحال مع اسم الظلم والطغيان ونحوهما، وقد كانت العرب في الجاهلية تقول في التلبية: "لبيك اللهم لبيك، لبيك لا شريك لك لبيك، إلا شريكا هو لك تملكه وما ملك"، بخلاف مسمى الكفر وما تصرف عنه، فإن أصل معناه الشرعي فيه قدر زائد على معناه في لسان العرب، كما هو الحال مع اسم الصلاة والزكاة والصيام ونحوها. قال ابن تيمية: "وأخذ مذاهب الفقهاء من الإطلاقات من غير مراجعة لما فسروا به كلامهم وما تقتضيه أصولهم يجر إلى مذاهب قبيحة" الصارم المسلول ص280 [ت:محمد محي الدين عبد الحميد]، ومن أقبح ما نسب لابن تيمية في هذا الباب، قولهم بما هو من جنس قول المعتزلة بالمنزلة بين المنزلتين: مشرك لا مسلم ولا كافر!! ومرادهم قبل بلوغ الحجة. [ومن أراد التوسع في بحث مسألة التحسين والتقبيح العقلي فعليه بكتاب: التحسين والتقبيح العقليان وأثرهما في مسائل أصول الفقه لعايض الشهراني، ويقع في ثلاثة مجلدات].

-

29

30

From those who affirm the necessity of worshiping Allah alone, the reason for their falling into shirk lies in their ignorance of the fact that their actions constitute worship that is directed to other than Allah, the Exalted. This issue has been extensively discussed in the book *Kashf al-Iltibas*, pages 121–126, 376–399, and 444. For a concise treatment, refer to *Majmu' al-Fatawa* 20/38-39, provided the reader has familiarity with the views of the Muʻtazilites and Ashʻarites on the matter of intellectual determinism of good and evil (*tahsin wa taqbih*), along with the response to Al-Akhnati on pages 91–92 and 218 [ed. Zahwi], in his discussion of this objector and those like him in both places. Here, he referred to them sometimes as Muslims and sometimes as polytheists, intending by the latter a description that rebukes and condemns their shirk intellectually, contrary to the Ashʻarites' principle in the matter of *tahsin wa taqbih*. This is what Ibn Taymiyyah meant by affirming the name (of shirk) before the evidence has been conveyed, not by judging them as non-Muslims—his context makes this clear—(contrary to the Muʻtazilite principle in the matter of *tahsin wa taqbih*). This is due to the presence of a barrier, which is the lack of access to the prophetic evidence, as the cause—here the invalidator—does not impact the ruling's existence when its barrier is present.

(Unlike the Ashʻarites, who consider the ruling to exist upon the cause, not because of it, and who treat the barrier as nullifying the ruling, consistent with their position—regarding divine decree—of denying the causal impact of worldly causes on legal rulings in the principles of jurisprudence. They thus regard causes, conditions, and barriers as mere signs without any intrinsic influence on the existence or non-existence of legal rulings. For those among them who speak of influence in this matter, they mean it metaphorically, not in the real sense that occurs by Allah's will. Those who interpret Ibn Taymiyyah's statement about "affirming the name before the evidence is conveyed" as affirming the legal ruling for them have applied his words according to Muʻtazilite principles. This is because he mentioned this in the context of discussing the principle of *tahsin wa taqbih* and his response to the Muʻtazilites and Ashʻarites. The linguistic meaning of the term shirk and its derivatives is established in the Arabic language before the advent of the message, as is the case with terms like injustice and tyranny. For example, the Arabs in the pre-Islamic period would say in their *talbiyah*: "Here I am, O Allah, here I am. Here I am, You have no partner except a partner who is Yours; You own him and all that he possesses."

In contrast, terms like disbelief (*kufr*) and its derivatives have a legal meaning that includes an additional aspect beyond their linguistic meaning, as is the case with terms like prayer (*salat*), almsgiving (*zakat*), fasting (*sawm*), and the like. Ibn Taymiyyah said: "Deriving the views of jurists from general statements without referring to their clarifications and what their principles necessitate leads to reprehensible views" (*Al-Sarim al-Maslul*, p. 280 [ed. Muhammad Muhyiddin Abdul Hamid]). Among the most egregious attributions to Ibn Taymiyyah in this regard is the claim that he held a view akin to the Muʻtazilite concept of an intermediate state—"a polytheist who is neither a Muslim

nor a disbeliever!”—and their intention was this state before the evidence is conveyed. Those who wish to delve deeper into the issue of *tahsin wa taqbih* should refer to the book *Tahsin wa Taqbih ‘Aqliyan wa Atharuhuma fi Masail Usul al-Fiqh* by Aaidh Al-Shahrani, which spans three volumes.

التعليق على النقل الرابع: من اقتضاء الصراط المستقيم، ومحل الشاهد قوله رحمه الله: "الدعاء المتضمن شركا، كدعاء غيره أن يفعل، أو دعائه أن يدعو".
وعلق عليه قائلا: "كلامه صريح في إدخال طلب الدعاء من الأموات ضمن الشرك".

وليس الأمر كما ادعى إذ من تتبع أقوال المخالفين في هذه المسائل كالسبكي ومن بعده كالرملي وابن حجر الهيتمي، يجد أن أبرز الصور الشركية التي سوغوها هي أن يقول القائل: يا رسول الله أو يا سيدي فلان اشفني ونجني ونحوه، وهذا مع أنه دعاء صريح، إلا أنهم يتأولونه، على معنى ادع الله لي بأن يشفيني وينجيني، بحجة المجاز العقلي لعلاقة السببية، وبحجة أن لا مؤثر حقيقة إلا الله، وهذا مبني على عقيدة الكسب عند الأشاعرة، فمع أن صيغة قولهم هو صريح الدعاء إلا أنهم يتأولونه على معنى سؤال الميت الدعاء، وهذا من الصور التي عالجها شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية في كتابه الاستغاثة، والقوم من العجمة أوتوا، إذ المجاز العقلي هو إسناد الفعل إلى غير ما حقه أن يسند إليه لوجود علاقة، بينما هم أبدلوا الفعل (يشفيني) بـ(ادع الله أن يشفيني)، كما أفاده مجدي بن حمدي في كتابه "الفرقان بين توحيد أهل السنة وتوحيد القبوريين" [31]، فضلا عن كون دعاء المشركين فيه هذا المعنى من المجاز العقلي لاعتقادهم أن الله هو المتفرد بالخلق والرزق والتدبير، وأن غرضهم من دعائهم غير الله هو وساطتهم التي لا ترد (وهذه الوساطة تكون أيضا بالدعاء)، وهذا لم يدفع عنهم حكم الله عليهم بأنهم كفار مشركون.
فعلى هذه الصورة يحمل قول ابن تيمية: "أو دعائه أن يدعو"، إذ قوله : "كدعاء غيره أن يفعل، أو دعائه أن يدعو" يتضمن ردا على مذهب أولئك، وكأنه يقول لهم: سواء اعتقد التأثير في غير الله أو لم يعتقد، فهذا لا يغير من كونه شركا أكبر، وذلك لكون الأصل الثاني لشبهة المخالفين زعمهم أن شرك مشركي العرب قاطبة علته اعتقاد الخالقية أو الرازقية أو التدبير في غير الله، وهذا مخالف لصريح القرآن، وصريح قول ابن عباس وجماعة من التابعين عند تفسيرهم لقوله تعالى {وما يُؤْمِن أكثرهم بالله إلا وهم مشركون} [يوسف:106]، ولا مخالف لهم من السلف، وقد صرح بشدة فساد هذا القول ابن جرير الطبري في تفسيره [32]، والقاضي ابن صاعد الأندلسي في طبقات الأمم [33]، وذكر الفخر الرازي الأشعري في مواطن متعددة من تفسيره أن سبب شرك عبدة الأوثان في العبادة هو اعتقادهم فيما تمثله الشفاعة الشركية لا غير [34].

وأيا كان فقد اتضح أن ما اعتمده الكاتب وادعى أنه صريح ليس بصريح.

-

Commentary on the fourth citation from *Iqtida' al-Sirat al-Mustaqim*, specifically the statement of Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy on him:

"Supplication involving shirk, such as calling upon someone else to act, or calling upon him to supplicate."

The commentator stated: *"His words explicitly include requesting supplication from the dead as a form of shirk."*

However, this is not as claimed. By examining the statements of those who opposed Ibn Taymiyyah on these matters, such as Al-Subki and later figures like Al-Ramli and Ibn Hajar Al-Haytami, it becomes evident that one of the clearest examples of shirk they legitimized was when someone would say, *‘O Messenger of Allah,’* or *‘O my master, so-and-so, heal me and save me,’* and the like. Despite the fact that this is an explicit supplication, they interpret it to mean, *‘Pray to Allah for me to heal and save me.’*

They base this interpretation on the concept of metaphorical attribution (*majaz ‘aqli*), arguing for a causal relationship and claiming that no one has actual power to effect change except Allah. This reasoning is rooted in the Ash‘arite doctrine of *kasb* (acquisition). Thus, although their statement is in the form of explicit supplication, they reinterpret it as asking the dead to supplicate. This is one of the issues addressed by Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah in his book *Al-Istighatha*.

These individuals, due to linguistic limitations, adopted such reasoning. In rhetorical terms, *majaz ‘aqli* is attributing an action to something other than what rightfully performs it, based on a relationship. However, they substituted the action *‘heal me’* with *‘pray to Allah to heal me,’* as noted by Majdi bin Hamdi in his book *Al-Furqan bayn Tawhid Ahl al-Sunnah wa Tawhid al-Quburiyyin* (p. 31). Moreover, the supplications of the polytheists themselves also involved this kind of metaphorical

attribution, as they believed that Allah alone is the creator, sustainer, and manager of affairs. Their purpose in supplicating others besides Allah was to seek intercession, which they deemed undeniable (and this intercession often involved supplication as well).

This belief did not exempt them from Allah’s judgment of being disbelievers and polytheists. Thus, Ibn Taymiyyah’s statement about *"calling upon someone to act or to supplicate"* is directed at refuting this belief system. It is as though he is addressing them, saying that whether one attributes real power to someone other than Allah or not, this does not change the fact that it constitutes major shirk. This is because the second foundational argument of their objection is their claim that the reason for the shirk of the Arab polytheists was their belief in the creative power, sustenance, or management of others besides Allah.

This contradicts the explicit teachings of the Qur’an and the clear statements of Ibn Abbas and a group of the Tabi‘in regarding their interpretation of the verse:

"And most of them do not believe in Allah without associating others with Him." [Yusuf: 106]

There is no disagreement among the Salaf on this matter. Ibn Jarir al-Tabari explicitly rejected this claim as severely flawed in his *Tafsir* (p. 32), as did Qadi Ibn Sa‘id al-Andalusi in his *Tabaqat al-Umam* (p. 33). Fakhr al-Razi, the Ash‘arite scholar, also noted in several places in his *Tafsir* that the cause of shirk among idol worshippers in acts of worship was their belief in what these idols represented regarding polytheistic intercession, and nothing else.

In any case, it has become clear that what the writer relied upon and claimed to be explicit is not explicit at all.

---

[31] انظر: ص131-140. وهو أفضل من رد على شبهة المجاز العقلي لتسويغ الشرك بصريح الدعاء.

[32] حيث قال: "عَنْ مُجَاهِدٍ {وَأَنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ} [البقرة: 22]، يَقُولُ: "وَأَنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ أَنَّهُ لَا نِدَّ لَهُ فِي التَّوْرَاةِ وَالْإِنْجِيلِ"، قَالَ أَبُو جَعْفَرٍ: وَأَحْسِبُ أَنَّ الَّذِي دَعَا مُجَاهِدًا إِلَى هَذَا التَّأْوِيلِ، وَإِضَافَةِ ذَلِكَ إِلَى أَنَّهُ خِطَابٌ لِأَهْلِ التَّوْرَاةِ وَالْإِنْجِيلِ دُونَ غَيْرِهِمْ، الظَّنُّ مِنْهُ بِالْعَرَبِ أَنَّهَا لَمْ تَكُنْ تَعْلَمُ أَنَّ اللَّهَ خَالِقُهَا وَرَازِقُهَا بِجُحُودِهَا وَحْدَانِيَّةَ رَبِّهَا، وَإِشْرَاكِهَا مَعَهُ فِي الْعِبَادَةِ غَيْرَهُ. وَإِنَّ ذَلِكَ لَقَوْلٌ، وَلَكِنَّ اللَّهَ جَلَّ ثَنَاؤُهُ قَدْ أَخْبَرَ فِي كِتَابِهِ عَنْهَا أَنَّهَا كَانَتْ تُقِرُّ بِوَحْدَانِيَّتِهِ، غَيْرَ أَنَّهَا كَانَتْ تُشْرِكُ فِي عِبَادَتِهِ مَا كَانَتْ تُشْرِكُ فِيهَا، فَقَالَ جَلَّ ثَنَاؤُهُ {وَلَئِنْ سَأَلْتَهُمْ مَنْ خَلَقَهُمْ لَيَقُولُنَّ اللَّهُ} [الزخرف: 87]، وَقَالَ {قُلْ مَنْ يَرْزُقُكُمْ مِنَ السَّمَاءِ وَالْأَرْضِ أَمَّنْ يَمْلِكُ السَّمْعَ وَالْأَبْصَارَ وَمَنْ يُخْرِجُ الْحَيَّ مِنَ الْمَيِّتِ وَيُخْرِجُ الْمَيِّتَ مِنَ الْحَيِّ وَمَنْ يُدَبِّرُ الْأَمْرَ فَسَيَقُولُونَ اللَّهُ فَقُلْ أَفَلَا تَتَّقُونَ} [يونس: 31]. فَالَّذِي هُوَ أَوْلَى بِتَأْوِيلِ قَوْلِهِ {وَأَنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ} [البقرة: 22] إِذْ كَانَ مَا كَانَ عِنْدَ الْعَرَبِ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ بِوَحْدَانِيَّةِ اللَّهِ، وَأَنَّهُ مُبْدِعُ الْخَلْقِ وَخَالِقُهُمْ وَرَازِقُهُمْ، نَظِيرَ الَّذِي كَانَ مِنْ ذَلِكَ عِنْدَ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابَيْنِ" اهـ (أفدته من كتاب الفرقان لمجدي بن حمدي). وهذا الذي رده ليس هو عين قول مجاهد بل هو لازم قوله، ودليل ذلك ما رواه عنه في تفسير الآية 106 من سورة يوسف.

[33] حيث قال في ص65: "وجميع عبدة الأوثان من العرب موحدة لله تعالى، وإنما كانت عبادتهم لها ضربًا من التدين بدين الصابئة في تعظيم الكواكب والأصنام الممثلة بها في الهياكل، لا على ما يعتقده الجهال بديانات الأمم وبآراء الفرق من أن عبدة الأوثان ترى أن الأوثان هي الآلهة الخالقة للعالم، ولم يعتقد قط هذا الرأي ذو فكرة، ولا دان به صاحب عقل. ودليل ذلك قول الله تعالى عنهم {ما نعبدهم إلا ليقربونا إلى الله زلفى}"اهـ. (أفدته من موقع الشيخ عبد الله الغزي).

[34] وهذه مقالة جامعة لأقواله: https://www.saaid.net/Doat/almuwahid/7.htm

-

Refer to pages 131–140 for a more detailed rebuttal of the intellectual metaphor (*majaz ‘aqli*) used to justify shirk through explicit supplication. The author noted:

*"From Mujahid: ‘...and you know’ [Al-Baqarah: 22] means, ‘...and you know that He has no equal, as stated in the Torah and the Gospel.’ Abu Ja‘far said: ‘I suspect that what led Mujahid to this interpretation and to attribute it exclusively to the People of the Torah and the Gospel, rather than others, was his assumption that the Arabs did not acknowledge that Allah is their Creator and Sustainer, due to their denial of their Lord's Oneness and their association of others with Him in worship.’ Yet this is indeed an interpretation. However, Allah, exalted be His name, has informed in His Book that they acknowledged His Oneness, but associated others with Him in worship. Allah,

exalted be His name, said: *'And if you ask them who created them, they will certainly say, "Allah"'* [Az-Zukhruf: 87], and: *'Say: Who provides for you from the sky and the earth? Or Who controls hearing and sight? And Who brings the living out of the dead and brings the dead out of the living? And Who governs all affairs? They will say, "Allah." Say: Will you not then be mindful?'* [Yunus: 31]."

Therefore, the preferred interpretation of *'...and you know'* [Al-Baqarah: 22] aligns with the Arabs' acknowledgment of Allah's Oneness and their understanding that He is the Creator, Originator, and Sustainer, which is similar to the knowledge held by the People of the Two Scriptures.* (Adapted from Majdi bin Hamdi's *Al-Furqan*).

The refutation provided here is not identical to Mujahid's words but is a logical extension of them. Evidence for this can be found in Mujahid's interpretation of verse 106 from Surah Yusuf.

On page 65, the author wrote: *"All idol worshippers among the Arabs affirmed Allah's Oneness. Their worship of idols was a form of religious practice adopted from the Sabeans, who venerated celestial bodies and idols representing them in temples—not the ignorant belief held by some followers of religions and sects that idol worshippers regarded idols as the creators of the world. Such a view has never been held by a rational thinker. Evidence for this is Allah's statement about them: 'We only worship them so they may bring us closer to Allah in position.'" (Adapted from Sheikh Abdullah Al-Ghazi's website).*

For a comprehensive collection of his statements on this matter, refer to this article: https://www.saaid.net/Doat/almuwahid/7.htm.

التعليق على النقل الخامس: من قاعدة عظيمة، ومحل الشاهد منه قوله: "فلو شرع أن يطلب من الميت الدعاء، والشفاعة، كما كان يطلب منه في حياته؛ كان ذلك مشروعًا في حق الأنبياء، والصالحين، فكان يسنّ أن يأتي الرجل قبر الرجل الصالح، نبيًّا كان، أو غيره، فيقول ادع لي بالمغفرة، والنصر، والهدى، والرزق، اشفع لي إلى ربك، فيتخذ الرجل الصالح شفيعًا بعد الموت، كما يفعل ذلك النصارى، وكما تفعل كثير من مبتدعة المسلمين.... ومعلوم أن هذا ليس من دين المسلمين، ولا دين أحد من الرسل، لم يسنّ أحد من الأنبياء للخلق أن يطلبوا من الصالحين الموتى، والغائبين، والملائكة، دعاء، ولا شفاعة، بل هذا أصل الشرك" اهـ.
وقد قدم الكاتب لهذا النقل بقوله: "ذكر أن طلب الدعاء من الأموات هو عين الشفاعة الشركية التي وقع فيها النصارى ومشركو العرب".

فأما كون ابن تيمية يتكلم عن الشفاعة الشركية التي عليها دين النصارى ومشركي العرب فهذا صحيح، ويشهد له قوله: "فيتخذ الرجل الصالح شفيعًا بعد الموت، كما يفعل ذلك النصارى"، وقوله بعد "بل هذا أصل الشرك":
"فإن المشركين إنما اتخذوهم شفعاء، قال تعالى {وَيَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لا يَضُرُّهُمْ وَلَا يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَيَقُولُونَ هَؤُلَاءِ شُفَعَاؤُنَا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ قُلْ أَتُنَبِّئُونَ اللَّهَ بِمَا لَا يَعْلَمُ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ}..."، وذكر غيرها من الآيات في الشفاعة الشركية.

وأما كون ابن تيمية يرى أن طلب الدعاء من الأموات هو عين الشفاعة الشركية، كما يزعم الكاتب، فهذا لا يسلم له به، وإنما كلامه متعلق بطلب الدعاء من الميت المصحوب بالشفاعة الشركية ـ ولهذا نجده يقرن بينهما في أربعة مواطن من كلامه المنقول ـ، وهذا خارج محل النزاع.

وأما طلب الدعاء من الميت بناء على اعتقاد أن ذلك أرجى لأن يستجاب، وأنه قد يُرد، لا مع اعتقاد أن له دالة على الله لا يرد له بها شفاعة (وهذا الاعتقاد هو الشفاعة الشركية)، فهذا كما سماه الشيخ بكر أبو زيد وساطة بدعية، ويمكن تسميته الشفاعة البدعية.

-

The commentary on the fifth excerpt from "Qa'ida Azeema" (A Great Principle), with the highlighted part being his statement: "If it were legislated to request prayer and intercession from the dead, as was done during their lives, then it would have been legislated for prophets and righteous individuals. It would have been prescribed for a person to visit the grave of a righteous man, whether a prophet or someone else, and say, 'Pray for me for forgiveness, victory, guidance, and provision; intercede for me with your Lord,' thereby making the righteous man an intercessor after death, as is done by

Christians and as is practiced by many innovators among Muslims... It is known that this is not part of the religion of Muslims or the religion of any of the messengers. None of the prophets ever prescribed for people to request from righteous individuals, whether dead, absent, or angels, prayers or intercession. Rather, this is the foundation of shirk."

The author introduces this quote by stating: "He mentioned that requesting prayers from the dead is the very same polytheistic intercession practiced by Christians and the polytheists of the Arabs."

As for Ibn Taymiyyah speaking about the polytheistic intercession associated with the religion of Christians and the Arab polytheists, this is correct, as evidenced by his statement: "Thereby making the righteous man an intercessor after death, as is done by Christians," and his phrase "this is the foundation of shirk": "For the polytheists only made them intercessors," as Allah says: **'And they worship besides Allah that which neither harms them nor benefits them, and they say, 'These are our intercessors with Allah.' Say, 'Do you inform Allah of something He does not know in the heavens or on the earth?'** [Yunus: 18]," along with other verses discussing polytheistic intercession.

As for Ibn Taymiyyah holding that requesting prayers from the dead is identical to polytheistic intercession, as the author claims, this cannot be conceded to him. Rather, his statements are related to requesting prayers from the dead in conjunction with polytheistic intercession, which is why he pairs them together in four instances from his quoted words, making this outside the scope of the dispute.

However, requesting prayers from the dead based on the belief that it makes it more likely for the prayer to be accepted, or that it may be rejected—not based on the belief that the deceased has influence with Allah that guarantees his intercession will not be denied (and this belief constitutes polytheistic intercession)—this is what Shaykh Bakr Abu Zayd referred to as "innovative mediation" and could also be termed "innovative intercession."

التعليق على النقل السادس: من قاعدة عظيمة، وقدم الكاتب له قائلا : "ذكر عقيدة الصحابة رضي الله عنهم في منع الطلب من الأموات وأنه شرك، فقال كما في قاعدة عظيمة:..."، وأكتفي بإيراد محل الشاهد، وسأجعله على قسمين: "... ولا يعبدون إلا الله، ولا يدعون غير الله.... بل قد علموا أن هذا كله من الشرك الذي حرمه الله ورسوله. ولا يدعون مخلوقًا، لا ملكًا، ولا جنيًّا، ولا بشرًا، لا نبيًا ولا غير نبي، لا عند قبره، ولا في مغيبه.... ولا يدعون مخلوقًا غائبًا، ولا ميتًا، ولا يستغيثون به، ولا يشكون إليه، ولا يطلبون منه مغفرة، ولا هدى، ولا نصرًا، بل يطلبون هذا كله من الله".
ثم قال: "ولا يفعلون كما يفعل النصارى فيستشفعون بالملائكة، أو الموتى من الأنبياء والصالحين، عند قبورهم أو غير قبورهم، ولا يقول أحد منهم: يا جبريل، يا ميكائيل، اشفع لي إلى الله، ولا يقول: يا إبراهيم، يا موسى، يا عيسى، اشفع لي إلى الله، كما يفعل النصارى، بل قد علموا أن الغائب لا يطلب منه شيء، والميت لا يُطلب منه شيء".

ولم يحسن الكاتب التقدمة لما في قوله "الطلب من الأموات" من إطلاق، إذ هذا يشمل الدعاء وسؤال الدعاء، كما يشمل ما كان من ذلك عند القبر وما كان بعيدا عنه، وكأن المخالف ينازعه في جميع ذلك حتى في دعاء غير الله!! وهذا سيتكرر عند تعليقه على النقل التاسع.

أما عن القسم الأول من كلام ابن تيمية، ففصّل فيه أولا في أنواع المدعوين من دون الله وأحوالهم، ثم ذكر أحوال المدعوين مرة أخرى وفصّل بعدها في صور الدعاء. وجميع ما أورده الكاتب في هذا القسم متعلق بالدعاء لا بطلب الدعاء من الميت، وهو محمول على الطلب من الميت بصيغة الدعاء والقصد منه سؤال الدعاء، على ما سبق تفصيله في التعليق على النقل الرابع، وهي أشهر صور الاستغاثة التي نازعه فيها السبكي وغيره، وهذا خارج محل النزاع، ويشهد لهذا الذي ذكرت قوله: "ولا يطلبون منه مغفرة"، فذكر أن الطلب منهم أنفسهم، وهذا هو دعاء غير الله، لا طلب الدعاء، وأن المطلوب هو "المغفرة" لا "الاستغفار"، وإن كان قصدهم غير ذلك إذ العبرة بظاهر القول.

وأما عن القسم الثاني، من كلام ابن تيمية، فهو متعلق بالشفاعة الشركية المنفية في القرآن، إذ هو ما ينطبق عليه قوله "كما يفعل النصارى"، وهذا الآخر غير محل النزاع، كما سبق بيانه في آخر الرد المجمل، وأيضا في التعليق على النقل الخامس، فراجعه، وسيأتي في الخاتمة مزيد توضيح للفروق بين الصورتين.

-

Commentary on the sixth excerpt from A Great Principle. The writer introduced it by saying: "He mentioned the creed of the Companions, may Allah be pleased with them, in prohibiting asking the dead and that it is shirk, saying as in A Great Principle...," and I will suffice with quoting the relevant passage, dividing it into two parts:

"... They worship only Allah, and do not call upon anyone besides Allah... Rather, they knew that all of this is part of the shirk that Allah and His Messenger prohibited. They do not call upon any created being, whether an angel, jinn, or human, whether a prophet or otherwise, not at their grave, nor in their absence... They do not call upon a created being who is absent, nor one who is dead, nor do they seek help from them, nor complain to them, nor ask them for forgiveness, guidance, or victory, but rather they seek all of this from Allah."

Then he said: "They do not act as the Christians do, seeking intercession through angels or the dead among the prophets and the righteous, whether at their graves or away from them, nor does anyone among them say, 'O Gabriel, O Michael, intercede for me with Allah,' nor say, 'O Abraham, O Moses, O Jesus, intercede for me with Allah,' as the Christians do. Rather, they knew that the absent cannot be asked for anything, and the dead cannot be asked for anything."

The writer's introduction was inaccurate due to the use of the general term "asking" from "the dead," as this includes supplication, asking for supplication, and includes both what occurs at graves and what occurs far from them, as if the opponent disagrees with him on all of this, even on supplication to other than Allah! This issue will recur in his commentary on the ninth excerpt.

Regarding the first part of Ibn Taymiyyah's statement, he first elaborates on the types of those invoked besides Allah and their conditions, then again mentions the conditions of the invoked and further elaborates on forms of supplication. All of the writer's quotes in this section pertain to supplication, not to asking for supplication from the dead. This is understood as asking the dead in the form of supplication, intending by it to request their supplication, as previously detailed in the commentary on the fourth excerpt. This is the most well-known form of seeking help contested by Al-Subki and others, and it falls outside the point of contention. Supporting this interpretation is his statement: "They do not ask them for forgiveness," as it mentions asking them themselves, which refers to supplication to other than Allah, not requesting supplication, and the object sought is "forgiveness," not "seeking forgiveness," even if their intention was otherwise, as the consideration is based on the apparent wording.

As for the second part of Ibn Taymiyyah's statement, it pertains to the intercession that is negated in the Qur'an, as it aligns with his statement "as the Christians do." This, too, is unrelated to the point of contention, as previously explained at the end of the general response and also in the commentary on the fifth excerpt. Refer back to it, as further clarification of the differences between the two cases will follow in the conclusion.

التعليق على النقل السابع: من قاعدة عظيمة، وسأنقل كلام ابن تيمية بصورة أتم مما نقله الكاتب لغرض سيتضح عند الجواب عن هذا الاستدلال، قال رحمه الله:
"والمقصود هنا التنبيه على أن الشرك أنواع:
فنوع منه يتخذونهم شفعاء يطلبون منهم الشفاعة والدعاء من الموتى والغائبين، ومن تماثيلهم.
ونوع يتقربون بهم إلى الله.
ونوع يحبونهم لا لشيء، بل كما قال الله تعالى {أَفَرَأَيْتَ مَنِ اتَّخَذَ إِلَهَهُ هَوَاهُ} [الجاثية: 23] يهوى أحدهم شيئًا فيتخذه إلهًا من غير أن يقصد منه نفعًا ولا ضرًّا.... وهؤلاء جعلوا لله أندادًا، كما قال تعالى {وَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَنْ يَتَّخِذُ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ أَنْدَادًا يُحِبُّونَهُمْ كَحُبِّ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَشَدُّ حُبًّا لِلَّهِ}.
وهذه الأنواع الثلاثة كانت في مشركي العرب وغيرهم *[[إلى ههنا انتهى نقل الكاتب]]*، ممن يقر بأن الله خالق السموات والأرض" ص135-136.
ثم علق الكاتب قائلا: "فقوله "ونوع يتقربون بهم إلى الله" صريح في أن طلب الشفاعة والدعاء من الميت والغائب هو دين مشركي العرب، وهذه الصورة هي مسألتنا بعينها: الطلب من الميت أن يدعو الله له. بل جعل الشيخ كلا الصورتين موجودة عند مشركي العرب، وأن حكمهما سواء".

فمحل الشاهد عند الكاتب إذا هو النوع الثاني، وعبارة ابن تيمية فيه مجملة جدا، والكاتب يغفر الله له لم يكلف نفسه البحث عما يفسرها من كلام ابن تيمية، ويتكلف بالتمسك بأدنى دلالة ولو من بعيد، ولو أنه نظر في سباق النقل ولحاقه، وتأمل سياقه لما وجد فيه حجة.
حتى أن شدة الإجمال في عبارة ابن تيمية أوقعت الكاتب في التناقض عند التعليق عليها، حيث قال: "فقوله "ونوع يتقربون بهم إلى الله" صريح في أن طلب الشفاعة والدعاء من الميت والغائب هو دين مشركي العرب".
فانظر كيف عرّف النوع الثاني في كلام ابن تيمية بالنوع الأول الذي قال فيه ابن تيمية "يطلبون منهم الشفاعة والدعاء من الموتى والغائبين"، مع أن ظاهر عبارة ابن تيمية تقتضي التفريق، إذ جعل كليهما نوعا مستقلا.
ثم قال الكاتب: "وهذه الصورة هي مسألتنا بعينها: الطلب من الميت أن يدعو الله له".
ومقتضى قوله هذا أن النوع الثاني فقط هو صورة مسألتنا، إذ لو أسقطنا شرحه للنوع الثاني لصار تعليقه هكذا: "فقوله "ونوع يتقربون بهم إلى الله" هي مسألتنا بعينها: الطلب من الميت أن يدعو الله له"، وما إدخاله النوع الأول بينهما إلا ليصل إلى هذه النتيجة، وهذا تكلف واضح، وكاشف لتساهل الكاتب الشديد في اعتبار ما ليس بصريح صريحا.
ثم بعد أن قرر النتيجة التي حام حولها في طول الكتاب وعرضه، رجع ونقض غزله بقوله: "بل جعل الشيخ كلا الصورتين موجودة عند مشركي العرب، وأن حكمهما سواء"، ولا أدري كيف استقام عنده أن يجعلهما صورتين مختلفتين، وهو قد جعل (تعريف النوع الثاني = النوع الأول = هذه الصورة هي مسألتنا بعينها)!!

-

Commentary on the Seventh Transmission from a Significant Principle

I will quote Ibn Taymiyyah's words more completely than the author did to clarify the reasoning when responding to this argument. Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy on him, said:

> "The point here is to emphasize that polytheism is of various types:
> One type involves taking intermediaries, asking them for intercession and supplications—be it from the dead, the absent, or from their statues.
> Another type involves seeking closeness to Allah through them.
> And another type is loving them without any purpose, as Allah said: {Have you seen the one who takes his own desire as his god?} [Al-Jathiyah: 23]. Someone becomes infatuated with something and takes it as a god without expecting any benefit or harm from it... These people have made others equals to Allah, as He said: {Yet there are men who take for worship others besides Allah as equals to Him; they love them as they love Allah, but those of faith are overflowing in their love for Allah} [Al-Baqarah: 165]. These three types existed among the Arab polytheists and others who acknowledged that Allah is the Creator of the heavens and the earth." (pp. 135-136)

The author then commented:

> "His statement, *'Another type involves seeking closeness to Allah through them,'* clearly indicates that asking for intercession and supplications from the dead and the absent was the religion of the Arab polytheists. This exact scenario is our issue—asking the dead to supplicate to Allah on one's behalf. Indeed, Ibn Taymiyyah affirmed that both scenarios existed among the Arab polytheists and that their rulings are the same."

Analysis of the Argument

The author focuses on the second type mentioned by Ibn Taymiyyah. However, Ibn Taymiyyah's phrasing here is highly ambiguous. The author, may Allah forgive him, did not exert himself to find

clarifications of this phrase from Ibn Taymiyyah's broader works. Instead, he clung to the weakest indications, even from afar. Had he examined the context of the quoted passage, both before and after, and pondered its broader meaning, he would not have found evidence for his claim.

The extreme ambiguity in Ibn Taymiyyah's statement led the author to contradict himself in his commentary. For instance, he wrote:

> "His statement, *'Another type involves seeking closeness to Allah through them,'* clearly indicates that asking for intercession and supplications from the dead and the absent was the religion of the Arab polytheists."

Notice how the author interpreted Ibn Taymiyyah's second type by equating it with the first type, where Ibn Taymiyyah explicitly stated that they "ask for intercession and supplications from the dead and the absent." Yet Ibn Taymiyyah's wording clearly differentiates between the two, treating each as a distinct type.

The author then added:

> "This scenario is exactly our issue: asking the dead to supplicate to Allah on one's behalf."

According to this statement, only the second type corresponds to the issue at hand. If we exclude the author's explanation of the second type, his commentary essentially reads:

> *"'Another type involves seeking closeness to Allah through them,' clearly corresponds to our issue: asking the dead to supplicate to Allah on one's behalf."*

The insertion of the first type into the argument serves only to reach this conclusion—a forced interpretation that highlights the author's excessive leniency in treating ambiguous phrases as unequivocal evidence.

Finally, after establishing the conclusion around which his entire book revolves, the author undermines his own argument by stating:

> "Indeed, Ibn Taymiyyah affirmed that both scenarios existed among the Arab polytheists and that their rulings are the same."

It is unclear how he reconciled treating the two scenarios as distinct while simultaneously equating the definition of the second type with that of the first type, as if to say:

> *(The definition of the second type is equivalent to the first type = This scenario is exactly our issue.)*

This contradiction is evident and undermines the coherence of the argument.

وآتي على بيان مراد ابن تيمية وأن ما قاله خارج محل النزاع، فقد قال قبلها رحمه الله:
"لا سيما إذا اعتقد ما يقوله المشركون الذين يقولون: إنما نعبدهم ليقربونا إلى الله زلفى، يقولون: هؤلاء خواص الربّ فنحن نتقرب إليه بهم كما نتقرب إلى الملوك بخواصهم، فكما أن آحاد الرعيّة لا تصلح أن تخاطب السّلطان، بل يدخل على خواصه حتى يخاطبوه له، كذلك نحن لا يصلح لنا أن نطلب من الله، بل نطلب من خواصه أن يسألوه، وإذا أقدمنا على الطلب منه كان ذلك سوء أدب عليه، واجتراء عليه، كما يكون ذلك سوء أدب على الملوك، واجتراء عليهم، فهذه من أعظم شبه المشركين الذين قال الله فيهم {وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مِنْ دُونِهِ أَوْلِيَاءَ مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّا لِيُقَرِّبُونَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَى} [الزمر: 3] أي: يقولون: ما نعبدهم.
وقال تعالى {وَيَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لَا يَضُرُّهُمْ وَلَا يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَيَقُولُونَ هَؤُلَاءِ شُفَعَاؤُنَا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ} [يونس: 18] فهؤلاء دعوا الملائكة، والأنبياء، والصالحين، وقد رد الله على هؤلاء في غير موضع من القرآن، ورسل الله كلهم ردوا على هؤلاء، وهذا الذي ذكروه من قياس الله على خلقه، قياس فاسد، وضربوا لله مثل السوء، والله له المثل الأعلى، وذلك أن الملوك هم عاجزون عن أمور الرعية، إن لم يكن لهم من يعاونهم، بل من يدفع عنهم الضرر، عجزوا وقهروا، وهم أيضًا لا يعلمون من أحوال الرعيّة إلا ما طولعوا به، وأيضًا فهم لا يحسنون إلى الرعيّة إلا لرغبة، أو رهبة.
والله سبحانه بكل شيء عليم، وعلى كل شيء قدير، وهو أرحم الراحمين، فهو يعلم السرّ وأخفى، فلا يحتاج إلى من يعرّفه بحاجته، بل هو يعلم حاجته، وهو وحده يدبر أمر السموات والأرض، ليس له ظهير، ولا وزير، ولا معين ، ولا مشير، قال تعالى {قُلِ ادْعُوا الَّذِينَ زَعَمْتُمْ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ لَا يَمْلِكُونَ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَمَا لَهُمْ فِيهِمَا مِنْ شِرْكٍ وَمَا لَهُ مِنْهُمْ مِنْ ظَهِيرٍ} [سبأ: 22]..." ص130-132، إلى أن قال: "والمشركون، مشركو العرب، لم يكونوا يعتقدون أن المخلوقات، كالملائكة، والأنبياء، والشمس، والقمر، أو الكواكب، وتماثيلهم، شاركت الربّ في خلق العالم، بل كانوا معترفين بأن الله خلق ذلك وحده، كما أخبر الله عنهم في غير موضع،كقوله {وَلَئِنْ سَأَلْتَهُمْ مَنْ خَلَقَ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضَ وَسَخَّرَ الشَّمْسَ وَالْقَمَرَ لَيَقُولُنَّ اللَّهُ} [العنكبوت: 61].... ومثل هذا في القرآن كثير، لكن كانوا يتخذونهم شفعاء يتقربون بهم إلى الله، كما قال تعالى {وَيَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لَا يَضُرُّهُمْ وَلَا يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَيَقُولُونَ هَؤُلَاءِ شُفَعَاؤُنَا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ} [يونس: 18] .
وقال تعالى {وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مِنْ دُونِهِ أَوْلِيَاءَ مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّا لِيُقَرِّبُونَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَى} [الزمر: 3].... *[[من ههنا بدأ نقل الكاتب]]*

-

Translation:

I will explain Ibn Taymiyyah's intent and demonstrate that what he said is outside the point of contention. He, may Allah have mercy on him, stated earlier:

> "Particularly when someone adopts the belief held by the polytheists who say: *'We only worship them so they may bring us closer to Allah in position.'* They claim: *'These are the special ones of the Lord, and we seek to draw near to Him through them, just as one seeks to approach kings through their close associates. Just as an ordinary subject is not fit to address the king directly, but must instead approach his inner circle so they may intercede on his behalf, similarly, we are not fit to ask Allah directly. Instead, we ask His special ones to speak to Him for us. Moreover, if we were to directly request anything from Him, this would be seen as bad etiquette and audaciousness toward Him, just as it would be bad etiquette and audaciousness to approach kings directly.'*

This is one of the greatest arguments of the polytheists about whom Allah said: {And those who take allies besides Him say, 'We only worship them so they may bring us closer to Allah in position.'} [Az-Zumar: 3]. That is, they say, *'We only worship them.'*

And Allah said: {They worship besides Allah that which neither harms them nor benefits them, and they say, 'These are our intercessors with Allah.'} [Yunus: 18]. These individuals invoked the angels, the prophets, and the righteous. Allah refuted their claims in several places in the Qur'an, and all of His messengers refuted these beliefs as well. This analogy they constructed between Allah and His creation is a false one. They likened Allah to the worst of examples, whereas Allah has the highest of examples.

Kings, after all, are incapable of fully managing the affairs of their subjects without assistance. If they lack helpers, they are rendered powerless and defeated. Furthermore, kings are unaware of their subjects' conditions unless informed, and they only benefit their subjects out of desire or fear.

In contrast, Allah, Exalted be He, is all-knowing and all-powerful. He is the Most Merciful of the merciful. He knows all secrets and what is even more hidden. He does not need anyone to inform Him

of a person's condition; rather, He knows it Himself. He alone manages the affairs of the heavens and the earth. He has no supporter, minister, helper, or advisor. Allah says: {Say, ‘Call upon those you claim besides Allah. They do not possess an atom's weight in the heavens or on the earth, nor do they have any share in either, and He has no need of them as supporters.’} [Saba’: 22]." (pp. 130–132)

Then Ibn Taymiyyah said:

> "The polytheists—the Arab idolaters—did not believe that creatures, such as angels, prophets, the sun, the moon, the stars, or their idols, shared with Allah in creating the world. Rather, they acknowledged that Allah alone created all of that, as Allah informed us in many places in the Qur’an. For example: {If you ask them, ‘Who created the heavens and the earth and subjected the sun and the moon?’ they will surely say, ‘Allah.’} [Al-‘Ankabut: 61]. ... There are many such verses in the Qur’an. But they took these beings as intercessors to bring them closer to Allah, as Allah said: {They worship besides Allah that which neither harms them nor benefits them, and they say, ‘These are our intercessors with Allah.’} [Yunus: 18]. And He said: {And those who take allies besides Him say, ‘We only worship them so they may bring us closer to Allah in position.’} [Az-Zumar: 3]."

[[Here begins the quotation used by the author.]]

والمقصود هنا التنبيه على أن الشرك أنواع:....... وهذه الأنواع الثلاثة كانت في مشركي العرب وغيرهم *[[إلى ههنا انتهى نقل الكاتب]]*، ممن يقر بأن الله خالق السموات والأرض" ص134-136.

فهذا أهم ما ورد من كلامه قبل النقل مما يفسر المجمل من كلامه، فهذا سباقه، وأما لحاقه فقد قال ـ بعد أن تعرض لشرك القائلين بقدم العالم ـ: ".... ولو كان هذا يفهم القرآن، ويعرف ما كانت عليه العرب، ويعرف التوحيد، والشرك؛ لتبين له أن ما يقرُّ به من التوحيد كان المشركون يقرّون به أيضًا، وهم مع هذا مشركون؛ حيث أحبّوا غير الله كما يحبّون الله، وحيث دعوا غير الله، وجعلوه شفيعًا لهم، وحيث عبدوا غير الله يتقربون بعبادته إلى الله، فهذا وأمثاله كان شركهم، مع إقرارهم بأن الله خالق كل شيء، وأنه لا خالق غيره" ص139.

وإذا تأملنا في السياق تبين لنا أن ما اكتفى بنقله الكاتب مراد ابن تيمية منه بيان شرك مشركي العرب وإبطال قول من يزعم أنهم يعتقدون في معبوداتهم من دون الله أنها شريكة مع الله في خلق السموات والأرض، وذلك لأن هذا من أعظم شبه القبورية، كما سبق التنبيه عليه.

وآتي الآن على بيان مراد ابن تيمية من النوع الأول والثاني من شرك مشركي العرب:

أما قوله عن النوع الأول: "فنوع منه يتخذونهم شفعاء يطلبون منهم الشفاعة والدعاء من الموتى والغائبين، ومن تماثيلهم":
فهذا يفسره قوله في السباق: "وقال تعالى {وَيَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لَا يَضُرُّهُمْ وَلَا يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَيَقُولُونَ هَؤُلَاءِ شُفَعَاؤُنَا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ} [يونس: 18] فهؤلاء دعوا الملائكة، والأنبياء، والصالحين".
ويفسره قوله في اللحاق عند ذكره لأنواع شرك مشركي العرب مرة أخرى: "...وحيث دعوا غير الله، وجعلوه شفيعًا لهم.... فهذا وأمثاله كان شركهم".
وهذا متعلق بما هو مصحوب بالشفاعة الشركية المنفية في القرآن، وهذا خارج محل النزاع.

-

Translation:

The purpose here is to highlight that polytheism has various types ... and these three types were found among the Arab polytheists and others [[Here ends the quotation used by the author]], who acknowledged that Allah is the Creator of the heavens and the earth." (pp. 134–136).

This summarizes the most important parts of Ibn Taymiyyah’s statements before the quotation, which clarify the ambiguous aspects of his words. This is the preceding context. As for the subsequent context, he said—after discussing the polytheism of those who claim the eternity of the world:

> "… If this person understood the Qur’an and knew the state of the Arabs, as well as the meaning of monotheism and polytheism, it would become clear to him that the monotheism he acknowledges was also acknowledged by the polytheists. Yet despite

> this, they were still polytheists because they loved others as they love Allah, invoked others besides Allah, made them intercessors with Him, and worshipped others to draw closer to Allah through that worship. This and similar acts constituted their polytheism, even as they admitted that Allah created everything and that there is no Creator besides Him." (p. 139).

Upon reflecting on the context, it becomes evident that what the author chose to quote was intended by Ibn Taymiyyah to explain the polytheism of the Arab idolaters and to refute the claim of those who allege that these idolaters believed their objects of worship shared with Allah in creating the heavens and the earth. This is because such a claim is among the most significant arguments of the grave-worshippers, as was previously noted.

Clarifying Ibn Taymiyyah's Intent Regarding the First and Second Types of Polytheism Among the Arab Idolaters:

Regarding the first type, Ibn Taymiyyah stated:

> "One type involves taking them as intercessors, asking them for intercession and supplications—whether from the dead, the absent, or from their statues."

This is clarified by his earlier statement:

> "And Allah said: {They worship besides Allah that which neither harms them nor benefits them, and they say, 'These are our intercessors with Allah.'} [Yunus: 18]. These people invoked the angels, the prophets, and the righteous."

It is also clarified by his later statement when mentioning the types of polytheism among the Arab idolaters again:

> "… And they invoked others besides Allah, making them intercessors with Him … This and similar acts constituted their polytheism."

This pertains to the type of polytheism associated with intercession, which the Qur'an categorically negates. Such actions are outside the scope of the current dispute.

وأما قوله عن النوع الثاني: "ونوع يتقربون بهم إلى الله" :
فهذا يفسره قوله في السباق: "لا سيما إذا اعتقد ما يقوله المشركون الذين يقولون: إنما نعبدهم ليقربونا إلى الله زلفى، يقولون: هؤلاء خواص الربّ فنحن نتقرب إليه بهم كما نتقرب إلى الملوك بخواصهم.... فهذه من أعظم شبه المشركين الذين قال الله فيهم {وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مِنْ دُونِهِ أَوْلِيَاءَ مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّا لِيُقَرِّبُونَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَى} [الزمر: 3] أي: يقولون: ما نعبدهم.... لكن كانوا يتخذونهم شفعاء يتقربون بهم إلى الله، كما قال تعالى {وَيَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لَا يَضُرُّهُمْ وَلَا يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَيَقُولُونَ هَؤُلَاءِ شُفَعَاؤُنَا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ} [يونس: 18]. وقال تعالى {وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مِنْ دُونِهِ أَوْلِيَاءَ مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّا لِيُقَرِّبُونَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَى} [الزمر: 3]".
ويفسره قوله في اللحاق : "...وحيث عبدوا غير الله يتقربون بعبادته إلى الله، فهذا وأمثاله كان شركهم".
وهذا متعلق بعبادة غير الله صراحة، ولا يعرف مثله فيمن ينتسبون إلى الإسلام سوى الإسماعيلية ونحوهم من فرق الباطنية الزنادقة، ممن يقول: إنه يعبد فلانا من البشر، وهو الآخر خارج محل النزاع.
ويلاحظ أن الآية 18 من سورة يونس تشمل كلا النوعين.

ولو أن الكاتب وفقه الله لكل خير تأمل ما في النقل التاسع عن ابن تيمية لوجد فيه ما يوضح مراده، حيث قال رحمه الله في الرد على المنطقيين: "فإن مشركي العرب .... كانوا يعبدون غير الله ليقربوهم إليه زلفى، ويتخذونهم شفعاء يشفعون لهم عند الله، بمعنى أنهم يدعون الله لهم فيجيب الله دعاءهم له"، وهذه الجملة الأخيرة قد سبق بيان المراد من مثيلاتها، وسآتي على ذلك بالبيان مرة أخرى في التعليق على النقل التاسع.

-

Translation:

As for his statement about the second type: *"And a type who seek nearness to Allah through them,"* this is explained by his earlier words:

"Especially if they believe what the polytheists say: 'We only worship them to bring us closer to Allah in position.' They claim: 'These are the special ones of the Lord, and we seek nearness to Him through them, just as we seek to approach kings through their close associates.' ... This is among the greatest arguments of the polytheists about whom Allah said: {And those who take allies besides Him say, 'We only worship them so they may bring us closer to Allah in position.'} [Az-Zumar: 3]. That is, they say: 'We only worship them.' ... However, they took them as intercessors to bring them closer to Allah, as Allah said: {They worship besides Allah that which neither harms them nor benefits them, and they say, 'These are our intercessors with Allah.'} [Yunus: 18]. And Allah also said: {And those who take allies besides Him say, 'We only worship them so they may bring us closer to Allah in position.'} [Az-Zumar: 3]."

This is further clarified by his later statement:

"And they worshipped others besides Allah, seeking to draw near to Allah through that worship. This and similar acts constituted their polytheism."

This refers to the worship of others besides Allah explicitly, which is not found among those who claim to be part of Islam, except for groups like the Ismailis and others of the Batiniyyah heretics, who claim that they worship certain human beings. This, too, is outside the scope of the current dispute.

It should be noted that verse 18 of Surah Yunus encompasses both types.

...

If the author—may Allah guide him to all goodness—had reflected on what was mentioned in the ninth quotation from Ibn Taymiyyah, he would have found clarification of his intent. Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy on him, stated in his refutation of the logicians:

"The polytheists of the Arabs worshipped others besides Allah to bring them closer to Him in position and took them as intercessors to intercede for them with Allah, meaning that they would invoke Allah on their behalf, and Allah would respond to their supplication."

This last sentence was previously explained in similar contexts, and I will clarify it again in my commentary on the ninth quotation.

التعليق على النقل السابع: من قاعدة عظيمة، وسأنقل كلام ابن تيمية بصورة أتم مما نقله الكاتب لغرض سيتضح عند الجواب عن هذا الاستدلال، قال رحمه الله:
"والمقصود هنا التنبيه على أن الشرك أنواع:
فنوع منه يتخذونهم شفعاء يطلبون منهم الشفاعة والدعاء من الموتى والغائبين، ومن تماثيلهم.
ونوع يتقربون بهم إلى الله.
ونوع يحبونهم لا لشيء، بل كما قال الله تعالى {أَفَرَأَيْتَ مَنِ اتَّخَذَ إِلَهَهُ هَوَاهُ} [الجاثية: 23] يهوى أحدهم شيئًا فيتخذه إلهًا من غير أن يقصد منه نفعًا ولا ضرًّا.... وهؤلاء جعلوا لله أندادًا، كما قال تعالى {وَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَنْ يَتَّخِذُ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ أَنْدَادًا يُحِبُّونَهُمْ كَحُبِّ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَشَدُّ حُبًّا لِلَّهِ}.
وهذه الأنواع الثلاثة كانت في مشركي العرب وغيرهم *[[إلى هنا انتهى نقل الكاتب]]*، ممن يقر بأن الله خالق السموات والأرض" ص135-136.
ثم علق الكاتب قائلا: "فقوله "ونوع يتقربون بهم إلى الله" صريح في أن طلب الشفاعة والدعاء من الميت والغائب هو دين مشركي العرب، وهذه الصورة هي مسألتنا بعينها: الطلب من الميت أن يدعو الله له. بل جعل الشيخ كلا الصورتين موجودة عند مشركي العرب، وأن حكمهما سواء".

-

فمحل الشاهد عند الكاتب إذا هو النوع الثاني، وعبارة ابن تيمية فيه مجملة جدا، والكاتب يغفر الله له لم يكلف نفسه البحث عما يفسرها من كلام ابن تيمية، ويتكلف بالتمسك بأدنى دلالة ولو من بعيد، ولو أنه نظر في سباق النقل ولحاقه، وتأمل سياقه لما وجد فيه حجة.
حتى أن شدة الإجمال في عبارة ابن تيمية أوقعت الكاتب في التناقض عند التعليق عليها، حيث قال: "فقوله "ونوع يتقربون بهم إلى الله" صريح في أن طلب الشفاعة والدعاء من الميت والغائب هو دين مشركي العرب".
فانظر كيف عرّف النوع الثاني في كلام ابن تيمية بالنوع الأول الذي قال فيه ابن تيمية "يطلبون منهم الشفاعة والدعاء من الموتى والغائبين"، مع أن ظاهر عبارة ابن تيمية تقتضي التفريق، إذ جعل كليهما نوعا مستقلا.
ثم قال الكاتب: "وهذه الصورة هي مسألتنا بعينها: الطلب من الميت أن يدعو الله له".
ومقتضى قوله هذا أن النوع الثاني فقط هو صورة مسألتنا، إذ لو أسقطنا شرحه للنوع الثاني لصار تعليقه هكذا: "فقوله "ونوع يتقربون بهم إلى الله" هي مسألتنا بعينها: الطلب من الميت أن يدعو الله له"، وما إدخاله النوع الأول بينهما إلا ليصل إلى هذه النتيجة، وهذا تكلف واضح، وكاشف لتساهل الكاتب الشديد في اعتبار ما ليس بصريح صريحا.
ثم بعد أن قرر النتيجة التي حام حولها في طول الكتاب وعرضه، رجع ونقض غزله بقوله: "بل جعل الشيخ كلا الصورتين موجودة عند مشركي العرب، وأن حكمهما سواء"، ولا أدري كيف استقام عنده أن يجعلهما صورتين مختلفتين، وهو قد جعل (تعريف النوع الثاني = النوع الأول = هذه الصورة هي مسألتنا بعينها)!!

-

وآتي على بيان مراد ابن تيمية وأن ما قاله خارج محل النزاع، فقد قال قبلها رحمه الله:
"لا سيما إذا اعتقد ما يقوله المشركون الذين يقولون: إنما نعبدهم ليقربونا إلى الله زلفى، يقولون: هؤلاء خواص الربّ فنحن نتقرب إليه بهم كما نتقرب إلى الملوك بخواصهم، فكما أن آحاد الرعيّة لا تصلح أن تخاطب السّلطان، بل يدخل على خواصه حتى يخاطبوه له، كذلك نحن لا يصلح لنا أن نطلب من الله، بل نطلب من خواصه أن يسألوه، وإذا أقدمنا على الطلب منه كان ذلك سوء أدب عليه، واجتراء عليه، كما يكون ذلك سوء أدب على الملوك، واجتراء عليهم، فهذه من أعظم شبه المشركين الذين قال الله فيهم {وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مِنْ دُونِهِ أَوْلِيَاءَ مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّا لِيُقَرِّبُونَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَى} [الزمر: 3] أي: يقولون: ما نعبدهم.
وقال تعالى {وَيَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لَا يَضُرُّهُمْ وَلَا يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَيَقُولُونَ هَؤُلَاءِ شُفَعَاؤُنَا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ} [يونس: 18] فهؤلاء دعوا الملائكة، والأنبياء، والصالحين، وقد رد الله على هؤلاء في غير موضع من القرآن، ورسل الله كلهم ردوا على هؤلاء، وهذا الذي ذكروه من قياس الله على خلقه، قياس فاسد، وضربوا لله مثل السوء، والله له المثل الأعلى، وذلك أن الملوك هم عاجزون عن أمور الرعية، إن لم يكن لهم من يعاونهم، بل من يدفع عنهم الضرر، عجزوا وقهروا، وهم أيضًا لا يعلمون من أحوال الرعيّة إلا ما طولعوا به، وأيضًا فهم لا يحسنون إلى الرعيّة إلا لرغبة، أو رهبة.
والله سبحانه بكل شيء عليم، وعلى كل شيء قدير، وهو أرحم الراحمين، فهو يعلم السرّ وأخفى، فلا يحتاج إلى من يعرّفه بحاجته، بل هو يعلم حاجته، وهو وحده يدبر أمر السموات والأرض، ليس له ظهير، ولا وزير، ولا معين ، ولا مشير، قال تعالى {قُلِ ادْعُوا الَّذِينَ زَعَمْتُمْ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ لَا يَمْلِكُونَ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَمَا لَهُمْ فِيهِمَا مِنْ شِرْكٍ وَمَا لَهُ مِنْهُمْ مِنْ ظَهِيرٍ} [سبأ: 22]..." ص130-132، إلى أن قال: "والمشركون، مشركو العرب، لم يكونوا يعتقدون أن المخلوقات، كالملائكة، والأنبياء، والشمس، والقمر، أو الكواكب، وتماثيلهم، شاركت الربّ في خلق العالم، بل كانوا معترفين بأن الله خلق ذلك وحده، كما أخبر الله عنهم في غير موضع،كقوله {وَلَئِنْ سَأَلْتَهُمْ مَنْ خَلَقَ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضَ وَسَخَّرَ الشَّمْسَ وَالْقَمَرَ لَيَقُولُنَّ اللَّهُ} [العنكبوت: 61].... ومثل هذا في القرآن كثير، لكن كانوا يتخذونهم شفعاء يتقربون بهم إلى الله، كما قال تعالى {وَيَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لَا يَضُرُّهُمْ وَلَا يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَيَقُولُونَ هَؤُلَاءِ شُفَعَاؤُنَا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ} [يونس: 18] .
وقال تعالى {وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مِنْ دُونِهِ أَوْلِيَاءَ مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّا لِيُقَرِّبُونَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَى} [الزمر: 3].... *[[من ههنا بدأ نقل الكاتب]]*

-

Translation:

Commentary on the Seventh Quotation:

This comes from a great principle, and I will present Ibn Taymiyyah's words in a more complete form than the author has quoted for a purpose that will become clear when responding to this argument. May Allah have mercy on him, he said:

"The purpose here is to point out that shirk (polytheism) has types:
One type is when they take them as intercessors, asking for their intercession and supplication from the dead and the absent, and from their statues.
Another type is when they seek nearness to Allah through them.
And another type is when they love them not for any reason, but as Allah said: {Have you seen the one who has taken his desires as his god?} [Al-Jathiya: 23]. One of them desires something and takes it as a god, not seeking from it any benefit or harm... These have made rivals to Allah, as Allah said: {And among the people are those who take besides Allah equals, loving them as they love Allah. But those who believe are stronger in love for Allah.}
These three types were present in the polytheists of the Arabs and others, [to here the author's

quotation ends], among those who acknowledge that Allah is the Creator of the heavens and the earth." (pp. 135-136).

Then the author commented, saying: "His saying, 'And a type they seek nearness to Allah through them,' is explicit in that seeking intercession and supplication from the dead and the absent is the religion of the polytheists of the Arabs, and this image is our issue: asking the dead to pray to Allah on their behalf. The Sheikh made both images present among the polytheists of the Arabs and treated both in the same way."

The point the author is focusing on is the second type. Ibn Taymiyyah's wording in this regard is very vague, and may Allah forgive the author for not taking the time to look for further clarification in Ibn Taymiyyah's other statements, and instead relying on a minimal interpretation, even if it is far-fetched. If only he had looked at the context before and after the quote, and considered its broader context, he would not have found a strong argument in it. In fact, the vagueness in Ibn Taymiyyah's statement led the author to fall into contradiction when commenting on it. He said: "His saying, 'And a type they seek nearness to Allah through them,' is explicit in that seeking intercession and supplication from the dead and the absent is the religion of the polytheists of the Arabs." Look how he defines the second type in Ibn Taymiyyah's words as being the same as the first type, which Ibn Taymiyyah described as "asking for intercession and supplication from the dead and the absent," even though the apparent wording of Ibn Taymiyyah indicates a distinction, as he made both types independent of each other.

Then the author said: "This image is our issue: asking the dead to pray to Allah for them." The implication of this statement is that only the second type is the image of the issue, because if we remove his explanation of the second type, his commentary would be: "His saying, 'And a type they seek nearness to Allah through them' is our issue: asking the dead to pray to Allah for them." His inclusion of the first type in the argument was only to reach this conclusion. This is a clear overextension and reveals the author's excessive leniency in considering something unclear as if it were explicit. After deciding on the conclusion he was pursuing throughout the book, he contradicted himself when he said: "Rather, the Sheikh made both images present among the polytheists of the Arabs and treated them as equal." I do not understand how he can reconcile his statement that both are different images when he earlier defined the second type in the same terms as the first type—these are the images of our issue.

I will now clarify Ibn Taymiyyah’s intended meaning and show that what he said is outside the scope of the dispute. He said, may Allah have mercy on him:

"Especially when they believe what the polytheists say, who claim: 'We only worship them to bring us closer to Allah,' they say, 'These are the special ones of Allah, so we draw close to Him through them, just as the common people cannot speak to the king directly, but they go to his special ones to speak on their behalf. Similarly, we are not suitable to ask Allah directly, but we ask His special ones to ask Him on our behalf. If we were to ask directly, it would be considered bad manners toward Him, just as it is bad manners toward kings to approach them directly.' These are among the greatest misconceptions of the polytheists, of whom Allah says: {And those who take allies besides Him, saying, 'We do not worship them except that they bring us nearer to Allah.'} [Az-Zumar: 3]. That is, they say, 'We do not worship them,' yet they take them as intercessors to bring them closer to Allah, as Allah says: {And they worship besides Allah that which harms them not and benefits them not, and they say, 'These are our intercessors with Allah.'} [Yunus: 18]."

Then he goes on to explain how the polytheists believed that kings need their special ones to intercede for them, and this analogy is faulty because Allah is far beyond such need. He is all-knowing, all-powerful, and merciful, unlike human kings. Allah doesn’t need intermediaries to know or help; He manages everything without assistance, as Allah says in the Qur’an: {Say, 'Call upon those you claim

to be beside Him. They do not possess even an atom's weight in the heavens or the earth, nor do they have any share in them, nor is there for Him any helper from them.'} [Saba: 22].

He further clarified that the polytheists of the Arabs did not believe that created beings like angels, prophets, the sun, the moon, or stars, or their statues, shared in the creation of the world. They acknowledged that Allah alone created all of that, as Allah tells us in several places, like in {And if you asked them, 'Who created the heavens and the earth and subjected the sun and the moon?' they would surely say, 'Allah.'} [Al-Ankabut: 61]. There are many such examples in the Qur'an. However, they used these beings as intercessors to draw closer to Allah, as Allah says: {And they worship besides Allah that which harms them not and benefits them not, and they say, 'These are our intercessors with Allah.'} [Yunus: 18]. And He also says: {And those who take allies besides Him, saying, 'We do not worship them except that they bring us nearer to Allah.'} [Az-Zumar: 3].*

[[This is where the author's quotation begins]]

والمقصود هنا التنبيه على أن الشرك أنواع:....... وهذه الأنواع الثلاثة كانت في مشركي العرب وغيرهم *[[إلى هنا انتهى نقل الكاتب]]*، ممن يقر بأن الله خالق السموات والأرض" ص134-136.

فهذا أهم ما ورد من كلامه قبل النقل مما يفسر المجمل من كلامه، فهذا سباقه، وأما لحاقه فقد قال ـ بعد أن تعرض لشرك القائلين بقدم العالم ـ: ".... ولو كان هذا يفهم القرآن، ويعرف ما كانت عليه العرب، ويعرف التوحيد، والشرك؛ لتبين له أن ما يقرُّ به من التوحيد كان المشركون يقرّون به أيضًا، وهم مع هذا مشركون؛ حيث أحبّوا غير الله كما يحبّون الله، وحيث دعوا غير الله، وجعلوه شفيعًا لهم، وحيث عبدوا غير الله يتقربون بعبادته إلى الله، فهذا وأمثاله كان شركهم، مع إقرارهم بأن الله خالق كل شيء، وأنه لا خالق غيره" ص139.

وإذا تأملنا في السياق تبين لنا أن ما اكتفى بنقله الكاتب مراد ابن تيمية منه بيان شرك مشركي العرب وإبطال قول من يزعم أنهم يعتقدون في معبوداتهم من دون الله أنها شريكة مع الله في خلق السموات والأرض، وذلك لأن هذا من أعظم شبه القبورية، كما سبق التنبيه عليه.

وآتي الآن على بيان مراد ابن تيمية من النوع الأول والثاني من شرك مشركي العرب:

أما قوله عن النوع الأول: "فنوع منه يتخذونهم شفعاء يطلبون منهم الشفاعة والدعاء من الموتى والغائبين، ومن تماثيلهم":
فهذا يفسره قوله في السباق: "وقال تعالى {وَيَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لَا يَضُرُّهُمْ وَلَا يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَيَقُولُونَ هَؤُلَاءِ شُفَعَاؤُنَا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ} [يونس: 18] فهؤلاء دعوا الملائكة، والأنبياء، والصالحين".
ويفسره قوله في اللحاق عند ذكره لأنواع شرك مشركي العرب مرة أخرى: "...وحيث دعوا غير الله، وجعلوه شفيعًا لهم.... فهذا وأمثاله كان شركهم".
وهذا متعلق بما هو مصحوب بالشفاعة الشركية المنفية في القرآن، وهذا خارج محل النزاع.

-

وأما قوله عن النوع الثاني: "ونوع يتقربون بهم إلى الله" :
فهذا يفسره قوله في السباق: "لا سيما إذا اعتقد ما يقوله المشركون الذين يقولون: إنما نعبدهم ليقربونا إلى الله زلفى، يقولون: هؤلاء خواص الربّ فنحن نتقرب إليه بهم كما نتقرب إلى الملوك بخواصهم.... فهذه من أعظم شبه المشركين الذين قال الله فيهم {وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مِنْ دُونِهِ أَوْلِيَاءَ مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّا لِيُقَرِّبُونَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَى} [الزمر: 3] أي: يقولون: ما نعبدهم.... لكن كانوا يتخذونهم شفعاء يتقربون بهم إلى الله، كما قال تعالى {وَيَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لَا يَضُرُّهُمْ وَلَا يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَيَقُولُونَ هَؤُلَاءِ شُفَعَاؤُنَا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ} [يونس: 18]. وقال تعالى {وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مِنْ دُونِهِ أَوْلِيَاءَ مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّا لِيُقَرِّبُونَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَى} [الزمر: 3]".
ويفسره قوله في اللحاق : "...وحيث عبدوا غير الله يتقربون بعبادته إلى الله، فهذا وأمثاله كان شركهم".
وهذا متعلق بعبادة غير الله صراحة، ولا يعرف مثله فيمن ينتسبون إلى الإسلام سوى الإسماعيلية ونحوهم من فرق الباطنية الزنادقة، ممن يقول: إنه يعبد فلانا من البشر، وهو الآخر خارج محل النزاع.
ويلاحظ أن الآية 18 من سورة يونس تشمل كلا النوعين.

ولو أن الكاتب وفقه الله لكل خير تأمل ما في النقل التاسع عن ابن تيمية لوجد فيه ما يوضح مراده، حيث قال رحمه الله في الرد على المنطقيين: "فإن مشركي العرب .... كانوا يعبدون غير الله ليقربوهم إليه زلفى، ويتخذونهم شفعاء يشفعون لهم عند الله، بمعنى أنهم يدعون الله لهم فيجيب الله دعاءهم له"، وهذه الجملة الأخيرة قد سبق بيان المراد من مثيلاتها، وسآتي على ذلك بالبيان مرة أخرى في التعليق على النقل التاسع.

-

The purpose here is to highlight that shirk (polytheism) has different types. These three types were found among the polytheists of the Arabs and others, *[up to this point, the quote from the author ends]*, those who acknowledge that Allah is the Creator of the heavens and the earth. (p. 134-136).

This is the most important part of his speech before the quoted text, which explains the ambiguity in his words. This is the context. As for what comes after it, Ibn Taymiyyah said—after addressing the polytheism of those who believe in the eternity of the world—:
"... If this person understood the Qur'an, knew what the Arabs were upon, and understood tawhid (monotheism) and shirk, he would realize that what they acknowledge as tawhid was also acknowledged by the polytheists, yet they remained polytheists. They loved other than Allah as they loved Allah, they called upon others than Allah, and they made them intercessors for them. They worshiped others than Allah to draw closer to Him. This, and similar actions, were their polytheism, even though they acknowledged that Allah is the Creator of everything and that no one else creates." (p. 139).

If we reflect on the context, it becomes clear that what the author quoted from Ibn Taymiyyah explains the polytheism of the Arabs and refutes the claim that they believed their idols were partners with Allah in the creation of the heavens and the earth. This is one of the greatest misconceptions of the "grave worshippers," as previously mentioned.

Now, I will clarify Ibn Taymiyyah's meaning concerning the first and second types of polytheism practiced by the polytheists of the Arabs.

As for his statement about the first type: "One type is that they take intercessors and ask them for intercession and prayers from the dead, the absent, and from their idols," this is explained in his earlier remarks:
"And they worship besides Allah that which harms them not and benefits them not, and they say, 'These are our intercessors with Allah.'" [Yunus: 18]. These people called upon angels, prophets, and the righteous.
This is further explained in his later comments when he mentions the types of polytheism again: "... And they called upon others than Allah and made them intercessors for them." This type of polytheism is related to the shirk of intercession that is negated in the Qur'an and is outside the scope of the dispute.

As for his statement about the second type: "One type is that they draw closer to Allah through them," this is explained in his earlier comments:
"Especially when they believe what the polytheists say: 'We only worship them to bring us nearer to Allah.' They say, 'These are the special ones of Allah, and we draw near to Him through them, just as we approach kings through their special ones... This is one of the greatest misconceptions of the polytheists, who Allah says about them: {And those who take allies besides Him, saying, 'We do not worship them except that they bring us nearer to Allah.'} [Az-Zumar: 3]. That is, they say, 'We do not worship them...' But they took them as intercessors to draw nearer to Allah, as Allah said: {And they worship besides Allah that which harms them not and benefits them not, and they say, 'These are our intercessors with Allah.'} [Yunus: 18]. And Allah also says: {And those who take allies besides Him, saying, 'We do not worship them except that they bring us nearer to Allah.'} [Az-Zumar: 3]."
This is further explained in his later remarks: "... And when they worship others than Allah to draw near to Allah through their worship, this and similar actions were their polytheism." This pertains to the worship of others than Allah explicitly, and such practices are found in groups that are not considered part of Islam, like the Ismailis and other groups from the Batiniyyah (heretical sects), who

claim to worship specific humans, and this is outside the scope of the dispute. It is important to note that verse 18 of Surah Yunus includes both types.

...

If the author, may Allah guide him to all that is good, had reflected on the ninth quote from Ibn Taymiyyah, he would have found further clarification of his intended meaning, as Ibn Taymiyyah said in his response to the logicians: "The polytheists of the Arabs used to worship others than Allah to bring them closer to Him, taking them as intercessors to intercede for them with Allah, meaning that they would ask Allah on their behalf, and Allah would answer their supplications. This last statement has already been explained in similar contexts, and I will elaborate on it further in my commentary on the ninth quote."

التعليق على النقل الثامن: من منهاج السنة، ومحل الشاهد منه قوله رحمه الله: "كَمَا وَجَدُوا بِتَسْتُرَ قَبْرَ دَانْيَالَ فَحَفَرُوا لَهُ بِالنَّهَارِ ثَلَاثَةَ عَشَرَ قَبْرًا وَدَفَنُوهُ بِاللَّيْلِ فِي وَاحِدٍ مِنْهَا، وَكَانَ مَكْشُوفًا وَكَانَ الْكُفَّارُ يَسْتَسْقُونَ بِهِ، فَغَيَّبَهُ الْمُسْلِمُونَ لِأَنَّ هَذَا مِنَ الشِّرْكِ".
ثم علق الكاتب عليه قائلا: "والاستسقاء بالميت يكون بأن يطلب من الميت أن يدعو الله له ويسأله إنزال الغيث. وهذا نص صريح أنه يرى الطلب من الأموات شرك".

وهذا الذي ادعاه الكاتب من أنه صريح ليس من الصراحة في شيء، وهو مجمل بأدنى تأمل، إذ صورة الاستسقاء المذكورة غير واضحة الأركان، فلا ذِكر فيها لصفة المستسقين غير كونهم كفارا ولا لطريقة الاستسقاء.

أما المستسقون فهم المجوس من بلاد فارس، إذ دفن نبي الله دانيال عليه السلام وقع بعد فتح العراق وكسر الفرس، وكان أهلها يتدينون بالمجوسية، والمجوس يعتقدون بوجود إلاهين اثنين: إله للنور وإله للظلمة، ويعبدون النار، عياذا بالله.

وأما عن طريقة استسقائهم به، فليست كما ادعى الكاتب اعتمادا على المعنى المعهود في كتب الحديث والآثار، وعلى المعنى اللغوي من كون "استسقاء" على وزن "استفعال" المفيد للطلب، إذ الطلب المستفاد من "استفعال" يكون بالقول كالاستغفار والاستعاذة والاستفتاء، ويكون بالفعل كالاسترزاق والاستطابة والاستنجاء والاستمناء، وبهذا يتبين أنه لا حجة في هذا النقل، ثم إن النقل يتعلق بأناس لا ينتسبون للإسلام.

ومما يبين أن النقل ليس على ما قرره الكاتب الأثر الذي رواه ابن إسحاق في السير والمغازي والبيهقي في دلائل النبوة عن أبي العالية رحمه الله، و جاء فيه: "... قُلْتُ: فَمَا صَنَعْتُمْ بِالرَّجُلِ؟ قَالَ:حَفَرْنَا بِالنَّهَارِ ثَلَاثَةَ عَشَرَ قَبْرًا مُتَفَرِّقَةً، فَلَمَّا كَانَ بِاللَّيْلِ دَفَنَّاهُ وَسَوَّيْنَا الْقُبُورَ كُلَّهَا؛ لِنُعَمِّيَهُ عَلَى النَّاسِ فَلَا يَنْبِشُونَهُ. قُلْتُ: فَمَا يَرْجُونَ مِنْهُ؟ قَالَ: كَانَتِ السَّمَاءُ إِذَا حُبِسَتْ عَنْهُمْ بَرَزُوا بِسَرِيرِهِ فَيُمْطَرُونَ. قُلْتُ: مَنْ كُنْتُمْ تَظُنُّونَ الرَّجُلَ؟ قَالَ: رَجُلٌ يُقَالُ لَهُ دَانْيَالُ..."، قال ابن كثير رحمه الله في البداية والنهاية: "وَهَذَا إِسْنَادٌ صَحِيحٌ إِلَى أَبِي الْعَالِيَةِ".
فالطريقة كما في ظاهر الرواية فعلٌ يفعلونه لا قول يقولونه، وهذا يجعل قول ابن تيمية خارج محل النزاع، ولو قلنا تنزلا أن الاستسقاء كان بالقول، وأهمل ذكره، فهذا جالب للاحتمال المبطل للاستدلال، فأنّى الصراحة في هذا النقل.

-

فإن ادعى الكاتب أن المعنى واحد، وأنه و إن لم يكن ذلك قد وقع منهم بلسان المقال فقد وقع بلسان الحال، وأن هذا لا يغير من كونه مطلقا شركا أكبر، لزمه أن يسحب هذا الحكم على ما أورده الإمام الدارمي في سننه، قائلا:
"بَابُ مَا أَكْرَمَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى نَبِيَّهُ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بَعْدَ مَوْتِهِ: حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو النُّعْمَانِ، حَدَّثَنَا سَعِيدُ بْنُ زَيْدٍ، حَدَّثَنَا عَمْرُو بْنُ مَالِكٍ النُّكْرِيُّ، حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو الْجَوْزَاءِ أَوْسُ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ، قَالَ: قُحِطَ أَهْلُ الْمَدِينَةِ قَحْطًا شَدِيدًا،فَشَكَوْا إِلَى عَائِشَةَ فَقَالَتْ: "انْظُرُوا قَبْرَ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَاجْعَلُوا مِنْهُ كِوًى إِلَى السَّمَاءِ حَتَّى لَا يَكُونَ بَيْنَهُ وَبَيْنَ السَّمَاءِ سَقْفٌ. قَالَ: فَفَعَلُوا، فَمُطِرْنَا مَطَرًا حَتَّى نَبَتَ الْعُشْبُ، وَسَمِنَتِ الْإِبِلُ حَتَّى تَفَتَّقَتْ مِنَ الشَّحْمِ، فَسُمِّيَ عَامَ الْفَتْقِ. رجاله ثقات وهو موقوف على عائشة".
ولست بغافل عما ذكره ابن تيمية في الاستغاثة في الرد على البكري في ص105 من عدم ثبوت إسناده وعدم استقامة متنه لمخالفته تاريخ الحُجرة النبوية، وإنما أوردته تنبيها على أن هذا الفعل لو كان صريحا في كونه مطلقا شركا أكبر ما كان هذا ليخفى على إمام من كبار علماء أهل السنة مثل أبي محمد عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن الدارمي رحمه الله، ولما رواه في سننه وبوّب له بقوله: "بَابُ مَا أَكْرَمَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى نَبِيَّهُ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بَعْدَ مَوْتِهِ".
وأما الاحتجاج بالحديث على معنى زائد على ما بوب به الدارمي كما يفعل القبوريون، فهذا من اتباعهم المتشابه، ولا يعكر صنيعهم على ما ذكرته، قال ابن تيمية في الاستغاثة في الرد على البكري: "أن هذا الفعل ليس حجة على محل النزاع سواء كان مشروعاً أو لم يكن، فإن هذا استنزال للغيث على قبره، والله - تعالى- ينزل رحمته على قبور أنبيائه وعباده الصالحين، وليس في ذلك سؤال لهم بعد موتهم ولا طلب ولا استغاثة بهم..."، إلى أن قال: "ولو صح ذلك لكان حجة ودليلاً على أن القوم لم يكونوا يُقسمون على الله بمخلوق ولا يتوسلون في دعائهم بميت ولا يسألون الله به، وإنما فتحوا على القبر لتنزل الرحمة عليه ولم يكن هناك دعاء يقسمون به عليه، فأين هذا من هذا؟!" ص105، ولم يعتبر رحمه الله ما وصفه بكونه "استنزال للغيث على قبره" ـ على فرض صحة الحديث ـ من الشرك أكبر.

وتأمل كيف فرق رحمه الله بين سؤال الميت عند قبره وبين الدعاء في قوله: "وليس في ذلك سؤال لهم بعد موتهم ولا طلب ولا استغاثة بهم"، وعطف الأخيرة من باب عطف الخاص على العام.

ثم لو سلمنا أن استسقاءهم كان بسؤال الدعاء من نبي الله دانيال عليه السلام عند حملهم لجسده الطاهر، فإن إطلاق القول بأن هذا شرك أكبر، ودعوى أن هذا من الوضوح بمكان، يلزم منه كذلك أن الإمامين ابن أبي شيبة والطبراني غفلا عن هذا غفلة مستنكرة، وخرجا حديث الزنادقة في المصنف والمعجم الكبير، وذلك لروايتهما حديث مالك الدار ـ الذي ورد فيه

-

سؤال النبي ﷺ بعد موته عند قبره أن يستسقي الله لأمته ـ، وهما إمامان من أئمة أهل السنة!! ثم يأتي ابن كثير ويصحح إسناده دون أن يتكلم في متنه ولو إشارة!! [35]

وعليه فما فُعل بجسد دانيال عليه السلام من استسقاء به، فيحمل اعتبار شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية له من الشرك، على ما هو معلوم من دين المجوس وما هم عليه من عقائد شركية، هي بذاتها شرك أكبر، وأنهم اعتقدوا إحداها في دانيال عليه السلام، إذ قوله "وَكَانَ الْكُفَّارُ يَسْتَسْقُونَ بِهِ، فَغَيَّبَهُ الْمُسْلِمُونَ لِأَنَّ هَذَا مِنَ الشِّرْكِ"، حكاية لواقعة حال لا تعمم إلا في مثيلاتها، وهذا أصلا ليس بالإمكان لما فيها من إجمال، وما تطرق إليه الاحتمال بطل به الاستدلال، أي الاحتمال القوي الذي يستوي مع سائر الاحتمالات لخلو جميعها من مرجح داخلي أو خارجي، فأنّى يكون مثل هذا صريحا.

-

Commentary on the eighth excerpt from *Minhaj al-Sunnah****, with the key point being the following statement from Ibn Taymiyyah:***

"As they found the concealed grave of Daniel, they dug thirteen graves for him during the day and buried him in one of them at night. It was uncovered, and the disbelievers used to ask for rain through it, so the Muslims hid it because this is a form of shirk."

The author commented on this, saying: "Seeking rain from the dead means asking the deceased to pray to Allah for them and request rain. This is a clear indication that asking the dead for help is shirk."

However, the claim that this is "clear" is not accurate. It is somewhat vague upon closer examination. The description of seeking rain is not clear in its details; there is no mention of how the disbelievers sought rain, only that they were disbelievers. The ones seeking rain were the Magians from Persia, as the burial of the prophet Daniel (peace be upon him) took place after the conquest of Iraq and the defeat of the Persians, who were adherents of Zoroastrianism. The Magians believed in two gods, one of light and one of darkness, and they worshiped fire, which is blasphemous.

As for the method of seeking rain, it is not as the author claims based on the conventional meaning in hadith and historical texts, or the linguistic meaning of "istisqa" (seeking rain), which is based on a

request made verbally, such as in the cases of seeking forgiveness, refuge, or knowledge. The verb form "istif'al" implies a request, either spoken (such as seeking forgiveness or counsel) or performed as an act (like seeking sustenance or purification). Thus, this passage does not provide clear evidence for the author's interpretation, and it pertains to people who were not part of Islam.

Additionally, there is a narration from Ibn Ishaq in *al-Sira* and *al-Maghazi*, as well as from al-Bayhaqi in *Dalail al-Nubuwwa*, from Abu al-'Aliya (may Allah have mercy on him), which says: "... I asked: 'What did you do with the man?' He said: 'We dug thirteen separate graves during the day, and at night we buried him and leveled all the graves so that people would not dig him up. I asked: 'What do you hope to gain from him?' He said: 'When the sky withheld rain from them, they would bring out his bier and it would rain.' I asked: 'Who did you think the man was?' He said: 'A man called Daniel...'". Ibn Kathir (may Allah have mercy on him) in *al-Bidaya wa'l-Nihaya* said: "This is a sound chain of narration to Abu al-'Aliya." In the narration, the practice appears to be an act (taking the bier out), not a verbal request, which makes Ibn Taymiyyah's statement outside the scope of the discussion. Even if we assume that the seeking of rain was through a verbal request and this was omitted, it still introduces doubt that weakens the argument. Thus, there is no clarity in this narration.

Translation:

If the author claims that the meaning is the same, and that even if this was not verbally done by them, it happened through their actions, and that this does not change the fact that it is universally major shirk, he must also apply this judgment to what was reported by Imam al-Darimi in his *Sunan*, where he says: *"The chapter on how Allah honored His Prophet after his death." Abu Nu'man narrated to us, from Sa'id ibn Zayd, from Amr ibn Malik al-Nukri, from Abu al-Jawzaa Aws ibn Abdullah, who said: 'The people of Medina suffered from a severe drought, so they complained to Aisha, and she said: "Look at the grave of the Prophet (peace be upon him), and make openings towards the sky so that there is no ceiling between him and the sky." So they did so, and it rained until the grass grew, and the camels became fat to the point of bursting from fatness. That year was called the year of the bursting.' The narrators are trustworthy, and it is a narration reported by Aisha."*

I am not unaware of what Ibn Taymiyyah mentioned in his *al-Istighatha* in response to al-Bakri on page 105, about the chain of transmission not being established and the text conflicting with the history of the Prophet's chamber, but I have mentioned it to point out that if this action were explicitly a form of major shirk, it would not have been overlooked by a great Imam of the Ahl al-Sunnah like Abu Muhammad Abdullah ibn Abdul Rahman al-Darimi, may Allah have mercy on him, and he would not have narrated it in his *Sunan* under the heading: *"The chapter on how Allah honored His Prophet after his death."*

As for using this hadith to argue for a meaning beyond what al-Darimi intended, as the grave-worshippers do, this is following the ambiguous (mutashabih). This does not affect what I have mentioned. Ibn Taymiyyah said in his *al-Istighatha* in response to al-Bakri: *"This action is not a proof for the matter under discussion, whether it is legislated or not. This is the asking of rain from Allah for the grave, and Allah, the Almighty, sends His mercy upon the graves of His Prophets and righteous servants. There is no asking them after their death, nor any request or seeking help from them..."* He continued: *"If this were correct, it would be a proof that the people did not swear by Allah using His creation, nor did they seek intercession from a dead person, nor ask Allah by them. Rather, they simply opened the grave for mercy to descend upon it, and there was no prayer in which they swore by it. So where is the comparison to that?"* (p. 105). He did not consider what he described as "asking for rain from his grave—assuming the hadith is correct" to be major shirk.

Consider how he differentiated between asking the dead at their grave and making a supplication, saying: *"There is no asking them after their death, nor any request or seeking help from them,"* and the latter is a specification (khass) under the general (aam).

Even if we assume that their asking for rain involved requesting prayer from Prophet Daniel (peace be upon him) while carrying his pure body, saying this is major shirk, and claiming it is clear, would imply that the two Imams Ibn Abi Shaiba and al-Tabarani overlooked this in an unthinkable way, and narrated the hadith of the heretics in *al-Musannaf* and *al-Majma' al-Kabir*, as they both narrated the hadith of Malik al-Dar, which mentions...

Translation:

Asking the Prophet (peace be upon him) after his death at his grave to ask Allah for rain for his nation, and these two are imams from the imams of Ahl al-Sunnah, then Ibn Kathir comes and authenticates its chain without commenting on its text, not even with a hint!!

Therefore, what was done with the body of Prophet Daniel (peace be upon him) regarding asking for rain through him, Ibn Taymiyyah's consideration of it as shirk is based on what is known of the religion of the Magians and their polytheistic beliefs, which are themselves major shirk. They believed in one of these beliefs about Daniel (peace be upon him). His statement "And the disbelievers used to ask for rain through him, so the Muslims hid him because this is from shirk" is a report of an event that does not generalize except to similar situations. And this is not even possible due to its ambiguity, and the potential that arises from it weakens the proof. That is, the strong possibility that is equal to all other possibilities because they all lack any internal or external distinguishing factor, so how can something like this be considered explicit?

[35] وهذا الأثر لا يصح، وليس عليه العمل بين الفقهاء، وهو مخالف للثابت عن الصحابة في خلافتي عمر ومعاوية رضي الله عنهم جميعا، واحتجاج شيوخ القبورية به على جواز دعاء غير الله عياذا بالله من اتباع المتشابه.

Footnote:

Translation:

This narration is not authentic, and it is not acted upon by the jurists. It contradicts what is established from the companions during the caliphates of Umar and Muawiya (may Allah be pleased with them both), and the use of this by the leaders of the grave-worshippers as evidence for the permissibility of invoking others besides Allah is, I seek refuge in Allah, an example of following the ambiguous.

التعليق على النقل التاسع: من الرد على المنطقيين، حيث قال ابن تيمية: "فإن مشركي العرب وغيرهم ممن يقر بأن الرب فاعل بمشيئته وقدرته وأنه خالق كل شيء وأن السموات والأرض مخلوقة لله ليست مقارنة له في الوجود دائمة بدوامه، كانوا يعبدون غير الله ليقربوهم إليه زلفى، ويتخذونهم شفعاء يشفعون لهم عند الله، بمعنى أنهم يدعون الله لهم فيجيب الله دعاءهم له، وهؤلاء المشركون الذين بين القرآن كفرهم وجاهدهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم على شركهم، قال تعالى {وَيَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لا يَضُرُّهُمْ وَلا يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَيَقُولُونَ هَؤُلاءِ شُفَعَاؤُنَا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ}، وقال تعالى {وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مِنْ دُونِهِ أولِيَاءَ مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إلاَّ لِيُقَرِّبُونَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَى}".
ثم علق الكاتب قائلا: "مثّل الشيخ رحمه الله شرك اتخاذ الشفعاء عند مشركي العرب بطلب الأوثان والأصنام أن تدعو الله لهم، حيث قال "بمعنى أنهم يدعون الله لهم" مما يدل على أنه يرى أن الطلب من الأموات شرك".

أولا: أنبه على أن قول الكاتب في آخر تعليقه: "مما يدل على أنه يرى أن الطلب من الأموات شرك" يحتمل حقا وباطلا، إذ يشمل (الدعاء) و (طلب الدعاء)، وهذا منه موهم أن المخالف من علماء أهل السنة ينسب لابن تيمية القول بأن دعاء غير الله من الشرك الأصغر!! وقد تكرر منه هذا الخطأ كما سبق التنبيه عليه عند التعليق على النقل السادس.

ثانيا: جميع ما ذكره ابن تيمية عن مشركي العرب خارج محل النزاع، إذ صورته أنهم "يتخذونهم شفعاء يشفعون لهم عند الله، بمعنى أنهم يدعون الله لهم فيجيب الله دعاءهم له"، وهذا صريح في كونه متعلقا بالشفاعة الشركية المنفية في القرآن وبدعاء غير الله، وهذا الشرك في الربوبية هو الذي جعلهم يدعون شفعاءهم من دون الله، معتقدين أنهم سيدعون الله لهم، ولما لهم من دالة على الله، فإن الله لن يقدر على رد دعائهم وسيستجيب كالمكره لهم ويجيب دعاءهم لا محالة رغبة ورهبة، تعالى الله عما يقولون علوا كبيرا، قال سبحانه {قُلِ ادْعُوا الَّذِينَ زَعَمْتُم مِّن دُونِ اللَّهِ ۖ لَا يَمْلِكُونَ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَمَا لَهُمْ فِيهِمَا مِن شِرْكٍ وَمَا لَهُ مِنْهُم مِّن ظَهِيرٍ * وَلَا تَنفَعُ الشَّفَاعَةُ عِندَهُ إِلَّا لِمَنْ أَذِنَ لَهُ}، وهذه الصورة خارجة عن محل النزاع.

-

التعليق على النقل العاشر والأخير: من اقتضاء الصراط المستقيم، وهو قوله: "والمقصود هنا: أنه إذا كان السلف والأئمة قالوا في سؤاله بالمخلوق ما قد ذكر، فكيف بسؤال المخلوق الميت؟ سواء سئل أن يسأل الله أو سئل قضاء الحاجة، ونحو ذلك، مما يفعله بعض الناس، إما عند قبر الميت، وإما مع غيبته".
ثم علق الكاتب قائلا: "فقد سوى الشيخ رحمه الله بين طلب الدعاء من الأموات وبين سؤال الأموات مباشرة".

ولما كان مقصود الكاتب من كتابه إثبات كون طلب الدعاء من الميت شركا أكبر، كان تعليقه ههنا مشعرا بأن ظاهر كلام ابن تيمية التسوية بينهما في اعتبار أن جميع ذلك شرك أكبر، وإنما مراد ابن تيمية أن جميع ذلك مُحدَث ومنكر، وأن السلف والأئمة لا يقرون هذا من باب أولى، وأما عن مرتبة حكم كل صورة إن كانت شركا أكبر أو أصغر، فليس في كلامه ما يدل على ذلك، ولا يلزم من التسوية بين جميع الصور في اعتبارها منكرا وإحداثا في الدين التسوية بينها في الحكم على جميعها بكونها شركا أكبر، هذا لا يقول به عالم، والكاتب نفسه في آخر كتابه ـ كما سيأتي ـ يقرر أن مسمى البدعة ينطبق عند ابن تيمية على الشرك الأكبر وما دونه.

-

التعليق على ما ختم به الكاتب مؤلفه:

ختم الكاتب بالتأكيد على أن (طلب الدعاء من الأموات) = (سؤال الأموات مباشرة)، هو الحق.
وعلل ذلك بأن: (طلب الدعاء من الميت) = (طلب للشفاعة من الميت) = (الدعاء أن يدعو له[36]).
وقال: "فلهذا كان صرفها لغير الله شركا أكبر، لأنها دعوة لغير الله".

ثم أجاب عما يرد في كلام شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية من كون سؤال الميت الدعاء بدعة، وأورد شواهد من كلامه يسمي فيها صريح الشرك الأكبر بدعة، ونقل جوابا آخر عن الشيخ صالح بن عبد العزيز آل الشيخ أن مراده بدعة حدثت في هذه الأمة ولم تكن في أهل الجاهلية بعينها، لا أنها ليست شركا أكبر.

وذكر أن الداعي إلى تأليفه كتابه أن "بعض المعاصرين من المرجئة وغيرهم ينسبون للشيخ أنه يرى أن ذلك بدعة وليس شركا"، وأن هذا منهم كذب على شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية.

-

Translation:

Commentary on the ninth quotation from *Refutation of the Logicians*, where Ibn Taymiyyah said: "The polytheists of the Arabs and others, who acknowledge that the Lord acts by His will and ability, and that He is the creator of all things, and that the heavens and the earth are created by Allah and are

not comparable to Him in existence, eternal as He is, they used to worship others besides Allah to bring them closer to Him and take them as intercessors to intercede for them with Allah, meaning they would ask Allah for them and Allah would answer their prayer." These polytheists, whose disbelief is clarified in the Quran, were fought by the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, for their polytheism. Allah said: {And they worship besides Allah that which neither harms nor benefits them, and they say, 'These are our intercessors with Allah.'} [Quran 10:18], and {And those who have taken besides Him protectors, [say], 'We do not worship them except to bring us nearer to Allah in position.'} [Quran 39:3].

The writer then commented, saying: "The Sheikh, may Allah have mercy on him, likened the polytheism of the Arabs in taking intercessors to asking idols and statues to pray to Allah for them, where he said, 'meaning they ask Allah for them,' which indicates that he views asking the dead as polytheism."

First: I would like to point out that the writer's statement at the end of his comment, "which indicates that he views asking the dead as polytheism," is ambiguous and can include both truth and falsehood. It includes both *asking* and *requesting to be prayed for*, and this leads to the misleading implication that some of the scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah attribute to Ibn Taymiyyah the view that invoking others besides Allah is a minor form of polytheism! This mistake has been repeated by him as previously noted in the commentary on the sixth quotation.

Second: Everything Ibn Taymiyyah mentioned about the polytheists of the Arabs is outside the scope of the dispute, as it is clear that they took intercessors to intercede for them with Allah, meaning they would ask Allah for them and Allah would answer their prayer for them. This is explicit in relation to the polytheistic intercession negated in the Quran and invoking others besides Allah. This polytheism in Lordship is what led them to call upon intercessors, believing that they would intercede with Allah for them. They believed that Allah would not be able to reject their invocation and that their intercessors would, as if by force, have their prayers answered. Allah is exalted far beyond what they say. Allah said: {Say, 'Call upon those you claim [as gods] other than Allah. They do not possess [even] the weight of an atom in the heavens or on the earth, and they have no share in either, nor do any of them assist Him.} [Quran 34:22], and {And intercession does not benefit with Him except for one to whom He has granted permission.} [Quran 34:23]. This scenario is outside the scope of the dispute.

Translation:

Commentary on the tenth and final quotation from *Iqtida' al-Sirat al-Mustaqim*, which states: "The point here is that if the salaf and the imams have said regarding asking the created being, as mentioned, then how about asking the deceased created being? Whether they are asked to pray to Allah, or asked to fulfill a need, and so on, as some people do, either at the grave of the deceased or in their absence."

The writer then commented, saying: "The Sheikh, may Allah have mercy on him, equated asking the dead for prayer with directly asking the dead."

Since the writer's intention in his book is to prove that asking the dead for prayer is major polytheism, his comment here suggests that the apparent meaning of Ibn Taymiyyah's words equates both actions in considering them all major polytheism. However, Ibn Taymiyyah's actual intent is that all of these acts are innovations and wrongful practices, and that the salaf and the imams would not accept this, let alone approve of it. As for the level of judgment on each scenario, whether it is major or minor polytheism, his words do not indicate that, and it is not necessary that equating these practices as innovations in religion would mean equating them all as major polytheism. No scholar would say that, and the writer himself, at the end of his book—as will be mentioned later—states that for Ibn Taymiyyah, the term "innovation" applies to both major polytheism and lesser forms.

Translation:

Commentary on the conclusion of the author's book:

The author concludes by emphasizing that asking the dead for prayer is equivalent to "asking the dead directly," and he justified this by saying: "Asking the dead for prayer = asking the dead for intercession = asking them to pray for you," and he added, "Therefore, directing it to others than Allah is major polytheism, because it is a call to other than Allah."

He then addressed what might be found in the words of Ibn Taymiyyah regarding asking the dead for prayer as an innovation, and he cited examples from his statements where he explicitly calls major polytheism an innovation. He also quoted another answer from Shaykh Salih bin Abdul Aziz Al Shaykh, who clarified that Ibn Taymiyyah meant an innovation that occurred in this ummah, which was not present among the people of ignorance, not that it is not major polytheism.

He mentioned that the reason for writing his book was that some contemporary people, like the Murji'ah and others, attribute to Ibn Taymiyyah the belief that asking the dead for prayer is an innovation and not major polytheism, and that this is a lie attributed to Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah.

وسأقسم التعليق على كلامه إلى ثلاثة أقسام:

القسم الأول من التعليق:

واضح من مضمون الكتاب أن صاحبه قد أهمل الفروق الدقيقة المؤثرة، فأوقعه ذلك في التسوية بين المختلفات.

وسأعرض بيان هذه الفروق بين مختلف الصور التي سوّى بينها على سبيل الإيجاز:

- **الفرق بين (صريح دعاء غير الله) وبين (الشفاعة الشركية المنفية في كتاب الله):**

فالأولى شرك في الألوهية، والثانية شرك في الربوبية.

- **الفروق بين (صريح دعاء غير الله) وبين (سؤال الميت الدعاء عند قبره كما يسأل الحي):**

فالأولى السؤال فيها متعلق بما لا يقدر عليه إلا الله، والثانية السؤال فيها ليس متعلقا بما هو من خصائص أفعال الرب.

والأولى إن تُوُجّه بها إلى حي كان شركا أكبر، والثانية يشرع طلبها من الأحياء.

والأولى تستلزم شرك الربوبية أو غيره من المكفرات الباطنة، والثانية لا تستلزم ذلك.

ودوافع الأولى ممتنعة عقلا، واعتقاد وجودها شرك أكبر، والأدلة وردت بنفيها، بينما دوافع الثانية ممكنة عقلا، واعتقاد وجودها ليس شركا، و وردت أدلة بثبوت وجود عينها أو ما هو من جنسها كونا.

-

- **الفروق بين (الشفاعة الشركية المنفية في كتاب الله) وبين كل من (سؤال الميت الدعاء عند قبره كما يسأل الحي) و(طلب الشفاعة لأجل الآخرة من الميت عند قبره كما تطلب من الحي):**

فالأولى من العقائد الباطنة، والثانية والثالثة من الأقوال والأعمال الظاهرة.

والأولى اعتقادها في الأحياء شرك أكبر، والثانية والثالثة طلبها من الأحياء مشروع في الجملة.

والأولى ممتنعة عقلا، واعتقادها شرك أكبر، والأدلة وردت بنفيها، بينما الثانية والثالثة دوافعهما ممكنة عقلا، واعتقاد وجودها ليس شركا، و وردت أدلة بثبوت وجود عينها أو ما هو من جنسها كونا.

وتفصيل هذه الفروق قد سبق في الرد المجمل، فلا حاجة لتكراره.

-

Translation:

First section of the commentary:

It is clear from the content of the book that the author has overlooked the subtle but important differences, which led him to treat different matters as if they were the same.

I will briefly present these differences between the various cases that he equated:

The difference between (directly calling on other than Allah) and (the polytheistic intercession denied in the Qur'an):

- The first is polytheism in worship (Shirk in Uluhiyyah), while the second is polytheism in lordship (Shirk in Rububiyyah).

The differences between (directly calling on other than Allah) and (asking the dead for prayer at their grave as one asks a living person):

- The first is related to something that only Allah has the power to do, while the second is not related to something that is exclusive to the actions of the Lord.
- The first would be major polytheism if directed to a living person, while the second is permissible to ask from the living.
- The first necessitates polytheism in lordship or other major internal acts of disbelief, while the second does not necessitate this.
- The motivations for the first are logically impossible, and the belief in it is major polytheism, with evidence denying it, whereas the motivations for the second are logically possible, and the belief in its existence is not polytheism, and there are evidences confirming its occurrence or something similar to it in existence.

The differences between the polytheistic intercession denied in the Qur'an and both (asking the dead for prayer at their grave as one asks the living) and (asking the dead for intercession on behalf of the Hereafter at their grave as one would ask the living):

- The first is a matter of internal beliefs, while the second and third are matters of outward speech and actions.
- Belief in the first regarding the living is major polytheism, while the second and third are generally permissible to ask from the living.
- The first is logically impossible, and believing in it is major polytheism, with evidence denying it, while the second and third are logically possible, and the belief in them is not polytheism, with evidence affirming the possibility of such acts or similar occurrences in existence.

The details of these differences have already been addressed in the general response, so there is no need to repeat them.

Footnote

---

[36] هذه عبارة ابن تيمية، ومراده منها (صريح دعاء غير الله)، لا (سؤال الميت الدعاء عند قبره كما يسأل الحي)، كما سبق بيانه عند التعليق على النقل الرابع والنقل السادس.

-

Translation:

This is a statement of Ibn Taymiyyah, and what he means by it is the direct invocation of other than Allah, not asking the dead for prayer at their grave as one asks the living, as previously explained in the commentary on the fourth and sixth quotes.

القسم الثاني من التعليق:

صنيع الكاتب بالإجابة عن كون تسمية ابن تيمية لسؤال الميت عند قبره بدعة لا يستلزم أن يكون ذلك شركا أصغر، لكونه أطلق وصف البدعة على ما هو شرك أكبر موهم بأنه لا حجة عند المخالف إلا ذلك، والأمر ليس كذلك، وهذا من الكاتب قصور في البحث.

ولو نظرنا في أجمع بحث جامع لأقوال ابن تيمية الدالة على أن سؤال الميت الدعاء عند قبره كما يسأل الحي ليست من الشرك الأكبر، وهو ما كتبه طالب علم يدعى أبا موسى الروسي في مدونته على الشبكة العنكبوتية تحت عنوان: "15 نقلا عن شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية في أن سؤال الميت أن يدعو ليس شركا أكبر" [37]، وهو مقال مفيد في الباب [38].

وخلاصة ما تضمنه مما يدل على المطلوب، مع تصحيح بعض العزو وإعادة ترتيب للنقول باعتبار أنواع أوجه الاستدلال بها، وهي خمسة أوجه:

> قوله عن طلب الدعاء والاستغفار: "فإن ذلك ذريعة إلى الشرك بهم وعبادتهم من دون الله تعالى" [انظر: قاعدة جليلة في التوسل والوسيلة ص289 (الفقرة رقم:769) أو الفتاوى 330/1].
وقوله: "فيفضي ذلك إلى اتخاذ قبره وثنا يعبد" [انظر: تلخيص كتاب الاستغاثة 454/1].
وقوله: "فإنها ذريعة إلى دعائهم من دون الله والإشراك بهم" [انظر: تلخيص كتاب الاستغاثة 244/1].

> ذكره لمراتب في الباب ثلاث، وجعل محل النزاع في مرتبة أخرى غير التي هي شرك بالله [انظر: الفتاوى 350/1]
وذكره لدرجات ثلاث، وجعل محل النزاع في درجة أخرى غير التي هي شرك صريح، وقسيمة له [انظر: اللمعة في الأجوبة السبعة ص31-37].
وذكره أن الأقوال المبتدعة مراتب، وتصنيفه محل النزاع في مرتبة أخرى غير التي هي من جنس عبادة الأصنام [انظر: تلخيص كتاب الاستغاثة المعروف بالرد على البكري 146/1].

> ذكره لعدد من صور خطاب الأموات، وقوله عنها: "فإن هذا الفعل منه ما هو كفر صريح ومنه ما هو منكر ظاهر"، وليس في الصور التي ذكرها ما ليس بكفر غير مسألتنا التي هي محل النزاع [انظر: تلخيص كتاب الاستغاثة 95/1].

> قوله عمن وقع في سؤال الميت الدعاء عند قبره: "وقد يفعل الرجل العمل الذي يعتقده صالحا ولا يكون عالما أنه منهي عنه فيثاب على حسن قصده ويعفى عنه لعدم علمه وهذا باب واسع" [انظر: اقتضاء الصراط المستقيم 289/2-290 والصارم المنكي لابن عبد الهادي ص265] [39].

> قول ابن تيمية: "فجمهور الأئمة لم يستحبوا ذلك، وإنما ذكره بعض أصحابهم". وما في معناه [انظر: مجموع الفتاوى 159/1 و241/1 وقاعدة عظيمة ص112 والرد على الأخنائي ص149 (ت:الزهوي) وص354 (ت:العنزي) والصارم لابن عبد الهادي ص265].

-

ثم إن ما ذكره الكاتب من كون ابن تيمية لا يقصر مسمى البدعة على ما دون الشرك، وأن مسماها يشمل عنده الشرك الأكبر، وما في ذلك من إدخال للاحتمال على مراده، مدفوع في مسألتنا بالنوع الأول من أقواله، التي ذكر فيها محل النزاع ضمن درجة ومرتبة غير درجة ومرتبة ما هو من الشرك الأكبر، وحكم عليها بكونها في درجة ومرتبة البدعة، ففرق في تلك المواطن من كلامه بين الشرك الأكبر والبدعة، وبهذا صار لا وجه لهذا الإيراد من الكاتب، وبطل جوابه عن الحجة الوحيدة التي نقلها عن مخالفيه.

-

Section 2 of the commentary:

The author's response regarding Ibn Taymiyyah's labeling of asking the dead for prayers at their grave as an innovation does not necessarily imply that it is a lesser form of shirk. By describing it as an innovation, he might have implied that the only argument from the opponent is this, but this is not the case, and this reflects the author's lack of depth in research.

If we consider a comprehensive review of Ibn Taymiyyah's views that indicate asking the dead for prayers at their grave, as one asks the living, is not the greater shirk, we find it summarized well in an article by a scholar named Abu Musa Al-Rusi in his blog under the title "15 Citations from Ibn Taymiyyah Showing Asking the Dead for Prayer is Not Greater Shirk." This article is beneficial on the topic.

The key points in this article, with some corrections and reorganization of the references based on their types of evidence, are as follows:

1. **His statement on asking for prayer and forgiveness**: “This leads to associating them with Allah and worshiping them besides Allah” [See: *Qawa'id Jalilah fi al-Tawassul wal-Wasilah* p. 289 (para. 769) or *Fatawa* 330/1].
2. **His statement**: "This leads to taking his grave as an idol to be worshiped" [See: *Summary of the Book of Istighatha* p. 454/1].
3. **His statement**: “This leads to invoking them besides Allah and associating them with Him” [See: *Summary of the Book of Istighatha* p. 244/1].
4. **His categorization of different levels**: He mentioned three levels in this regard, with the actual dispute being over a level that is not equivalent to associating partners with Allah [See: *Fatawa* 350/1]. He also mentioned three degrees and placed the issue of dispute in a category that is not related to explicit shirk, contrasting it with the worship of idols [See: *Al-Lumma fi al-Ajwibah al-Sab'ah* p. 31-37]. He categorized innovated sayings into levels and stated that the dispute in question was of a type other than the worship of idols [See: *Summary of the Book of Istighatha*, known as *Refutation of al-Bakri* p. 146/1].
5. **His statement on various forms of addressing the dead**: “Some of these acts are outright disbelief, while others are a clear evil.” However, none of the examples he provided fall outside of this dispute, which is our specific issue [See: *Summary of the Book of Istighatha* p. 95/1].
6. **His statement about those who ask the dead for prayers at their grave**: "A person may perform an act that he believes is righteous without knowing it is forbidden, and he will be rewarded for his good intention and excused for his ignorance. This is a broad issue" [See: *Iqtiyad al-Sirat al-Mustaqim* p. 289/2-290, and *Al-Sarim al-Munki* by Ibn Abdul Hadi, p. 265].
7. **Ibn Taymiyyah's statement**: “The majority of scholars did not recommend this, but some of their followers mentioned it” [See: *Majmu' al-Fatawa* 159/1, 241/1, *Qawa’id Azimah* p. 112, *Refutation of al-Akhna’i* p. 149 (by al-Zuhwi), p. 354 (by al-Anzi), *Al-Sarim* by Ibn Abdul Hadi, p. 265].

Regarding what the author mentioned about Ibn Taymiyyah not limiting the term “innovation” to actions less than shirk, and that he includes greater shirk under this term, this argument is refuted in our specific issue. The first type of statement from Ibn Taymiyyah clearly distinguishes the dispute as being in a category other than that of greater shirk. He judged it to be an innovation, not greater shirk, and therefore, this response from the author is baseless. Thus, the rebuttal to the only argument the author presented from the opponents of Ibn Taymiyyah is invalid.

Footnote:

---

[37] وهذا رابط المقال: html.14/09/2015/http://abo-musa.blogspot.com ، وقد أفدت منه كثيرا.

[38] ولا يعنيني ههنا مستواه العلمي ولا توجهاته، فالحكمة ضالة المؤمن.

[39] وقد جعل الشيخ أبابطين رحمه الله في الانتصار ص38-39 [ت:الفريان] هذه العبارة وما بعدها قاصرة على "سياق الكلام في بعض البدع: كتحري دعاء الله عند قبر النبي ﷺ أو غيره"، وهذا لا يُسلم به، ويكشف خطأه في ذلك دلالة السياق، حيث قالها ابن تيمية بعد كلامه عن التأويل الفاسد لقوله تعالى {وَلَوْ أَنَّهُمْ إِذْ ظَلَمُوا أَنفُسَهُمْ جَاءُوكَ فَاسْتَغْفَرُوا اللَّهَ وَاسْتَغْفَرَ لَهُمُ الرَّسُولُ} بسؤاله الاستغفار بعد وفاته ﷺ، وعن حكاية العتبي في سؤال الأعرابي النبي صلى عليه وسلم بعد وفاته الاستسقاء لأمته.

-

Here is the translation of the text you provided:

37
38
39

This is the link to the article: http://abo-musa.blogspot.com/14/09/2015.html, from which I have benefited greatly. Its scientific level or orientations are not my concern here, as wisdom is the lost property of the believer.

Sheikh Aba Butayn (may Allah have mercy on him) in *Al-Intisar* (pp. 38-39, ed. Al-Faryan) confined this statement and what follows it to the context of discussing certain innovations, such as seeking to make supplications to Allah specifically at the grave of the Prophet (peace be upon him) or others. This interpretation is not accepted, and its error is exposed by the indication of the context. Ibn Taymiyyah made this statement after his discussion of the false interpretation of the verse:

> **"And if, when they wronged themselves, they had come to you, [O Muhammad], and asked forgiveness of Allah and the Messenger had asked forgiveness for them..."**
> [Quran 4:64]

...regarding asking for the Prophet’s intercession after his death, and the narration of Al-‘Utbi about the Bedouin who asked the Prophet (peace be upon him) after his death to seek rain for his nation.

القسم الثالث من التعليق:

ذكره لسبب التأليف في هذا الموضوع كون "بعض المعاصرين من المرجئة وغيرهم ينسبون للشيخ أنه يرى أن ذلك بدعة وليس شركا"، فيه إيهام للقارئ بأن المخالف بين مبتدع ومغمور، وليس الأمر كذلك، فممن نسب لابن تيمية القول بأن سؤال الميت الدعاء عند قبره ليس شركا أكبر الشيخ عبد الرحمن البراك [40]، وهو من كبار أهل العلم ومن أهل التحقيق والتدقيق في مسائل الاعتقاد، ونسبه له أيضا الشيخ العثيمين رحمه الله في تعليقه على اقتضاء الصراط المستقيم [41]، وهو من المعتنين بكتب شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية.

وأما الذين نسبهم إلى الإرجاء فأظنه يقصد الشيخ المحدث حاتم الشريف العوني، وهو مخلط في عدد من مسائل الاعتقاد هداه الله، ويسلك في باب توحيد العبادة مسلك مشايخ القبورية والمجادلين عنهم في تقرير حقيقة شرك العبادة .
وكان ينبغي للكاتب أيمن أن يأتي على ذكر هذا الداعي لتأليف الكتاب في المقدمة، حتى يتضح للمتابع للساحة العلمية وجهة الكاتب لتعلق ذلك بمقاصد التأليف.

-

Section Three of the Commentary:

The author mentions his reason for writing on this topic as being the claim by some contemporary individuals—referred to as Murji’ah and others—that Ibn Taymiyyah considered asking the deceased for supplication at their graves to be an innovation (bid‘ah), not major shirk. This creates the

impression for the reader that any opposition consists solely of innovators or obscure figures. However, this is not the case.

Among those who attributed to Ibn Taymiyyah the view that asking the deceased for supplication at their graves is not major shirk is Sheikh Abdulrahman Al-Barrak, a senior scholar and a figure known for his precision and investigation in matters of creed. Additionally, Sheikh Ibn Uthaymeen (may Allah have mercy on him) is also cited as supporting this view in his commentary on *Iqtidā' al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm*, a work he was deeply invested in studying.

As for those the author accuses of being Murji'ah, it is likely he means Sheikh Hatim al-Sharif al-Awni, a well-known hadith scholar. Al-Awni has taken a mixed approach in several issues of creed (may Allah guide him). In the area of worship-related monotheism (*Tawhid al-'Ibādah*), he follows the path of certain proponents of grave practices (*Qubūriyyah*) and their defenders, particularly in explaining the reality of worship-related shirk.

It would have been more fitting for the author, Ayman, to explicitly include this motivation for writing his book in the introduction. Doing so would have clarified his purpose and allowed readers of scholarly circles to better understand the context and objectives of his work, particularly given its relevance to the current discourse in academic and theological studies.

Footnote:

---

[40] https://www.islamweb.net/ar/fatwa/187225/%D8%AF%D8%B9%D8%A7%D8%A1-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D9%85%D9%88%D8%A7%D8%AA-%D8%A8%D9%8A%D9%86-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B4%D8%B1%D9%83-%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A7%D8%A8%D8%AA%D8%AF%D8%A7%D8%B9

[41] شرح اقتضاء الصراط المستقيم ص680، أفادني به الشيخ سلطان العميري.

"**https://www.islamweb.net/ar/fatwa/187225/** (*Dua li-al-amwat*: Between Shirk and Innovation).
Explanation of *Iqtida' as-Sirat al-Mustaqim*, page 680, as conveyed by Sheikh Sultan Al-'Amiri."**

وفي الختام أقول:

إن بحث الكاتب بعيد عن التحقيق والتدقيق وقواعد البحث العلمي، وليس من التحرير في شيء، حيث:

- لم يحط علما بمذاهب الناس حول كلام ابن تيمية في هذه المسألة، وحصرها في مذهبين، وأغفل المذهب الوسط الذي هو الصواب في تحرير مذهب ابن تيمية والحق في ذاته.
- و لم يحرر موطن النزاع بين مختلف هذه المذاهب.
- و لم يقف على حجج أصحاب القول الصواب في تحرير مذهب ابن تيمية ونقولاتهم عنه، فضلا عن أن يجيب عنها.
- و ردّ الباطل بباطل آخر، وأجمل ما هو مفصل.
- و لم يراع عند احتجاجه بكلام ابن تيمية أحوال من يذكرهم من أهل الملل والنِّحَل وما يدينون به حتى يفهم عليه مراده في الرد عليهم.
- ولم يراع سياق كلام ابن تيمة عند تفهمه، وأحياناً يجتزأ ما ينقله منه اجتزاء مخلا بالمعنى.
- ولم يبحث عما يفسر مجمله من كلامه.
- و كثيرا ما يجعل ما ليس بصريح من كلام ابن تيمية صريحا على ما يسوقه من أجله.
- ولم يعرف عادة ابن تيمية عند حديثه عن مصطلحي "دعاء غير الله" و"الشفاعة".
- و لم ينتبه للفروق المؤثرة بين الصور المتشابهة ولا إلى لوازم قوله.
- و أَوْهَم كون المخالفين بين مبتدع ومغمور وأن حجتهم فيما ذهبوا إليه حجة يتيمة ضعيفة.

فهذه أحد عشر خطأ في منهجية البحث، هي منشأ غلطه على ابن تيمية.

-

In conclusion, I say:

The writer's research is far from thorough investigation and the principles of scientific research. It is not in any way a refined work, as he:

- Did not fully understand the various opinions regarding Ibn Taymiyyah’s views on this issue, narrowing them down to two opinions and ignoring the middle ground, which is the correct interpretation of Ibn Taymiyyah’s position and the truth in itself.
- Did not clarify the point of contention between the different schools of thought.
- Did not consider the arguments of those who correctly interpreted Ibn Taymiyyah’s views and the citations they made from him, let alone respond to them.
- Replied to falsehood with another falsehood, summarizing detailed points in a vague manner.
- Did not consider the context of Ibn Taymiyyah's words when using them in his arguments, and at times, quoted them in a way that distorted the meaning.
- Did not research the parts of his statements that required clarification.
- Frequently misrepresented what was not explicit in Ibn Taymiyyah’s words as if it were clear and straightforward, for the purposes of his argument.
- Did not understand Ibn Taymiyyah’s usual approach when discussing the terms "calling upon others besides Allah" and "intercession."
- Failed to notice the significant differences between similar scenarios and the implications of his statements.
- Gave the impression that the opponents were either innovators or misguided, and that their argument was weak and unsubstantiated.

These are eleven errors in his research methodology, which are the source of his mistakes regarding Ibn Taymiyyah.

قال شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية رحمه الله في منهجية تفسير كلام أهل العلم:
"لَيْسَ لِأَحَدٍ أَنْ يَحْمِلَ كَلَامَ أَحَدٍ مِن النَّاسِ إلَّا عَلَى مَا عُرِفَ أَنَّهُ أَرَادَهُ لَا عَلَى مَا يَحْتَمِلُهُ ذَلِكَ اللَّفْظُ فِي كَلَامِ كُلِّ أَحَدٍ"
مجموع الفتاوى 36/7.

وقال: "فإنه يجب أن يفسر كلام المتكلم بعضه ببعض، ويؤخذ كلامه هاهنا وهاهنا، وتعرف ما عادته يَعْنِيه ويريده بذلك اللفظ إذا تكلم به، وتعرف المعاني التي عرف أنه أرادها في موضع آخر، فإذا عرف عرفه وعادته في معانيه وألفاظه كان هذا مما يستعان به على معرفة مراده، وأما إذا استعمل لفظه في معنى لم تجر عادته باستعماله فيه، وترك استعماله في المعنى الذي جرت عادته باستعماله فيه، وحمل كلامه على خلاف المعنى الذي قد عرف أنه يريده بذلك اللفظ يجعل كلامه متناقضا، ويترك كلامه على ما يناسب سائر كلامه، كان ذلك تحريفا لكلامه عن موضعه وتبديلا لمقاصده وكذبا عليه" الجواب الصحيح 303/2 [ت:مجدي قاسم].

وقال أيضا: "وأخذ مذاهب الفقهاء من الإطلاقات من غير مراجعة لما فسروا به كلامهم وما تقتضيه أصولهم يجر إلى مذاهب قبيحة" الصارم المسلول ص280 [ت:محمد محي الدين عبد الحميد].

وهذه المنهجية لم يراع الكاتب غفر الله له في تحريره شيئا منها، فكانت النتيجة ما ذكره ابن تيمية.
والله الموفق للصواب، الهادي إلى سبيل الرشاد.
والحمد لله والصلاة والسلام على رسول الله.

كتبه ولد الحاج محمد الإفريقي
وانتهى منه في ذي القعدة 1441 هـ [42]

-

Sheikh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy on him, said in his methodology of interpreting the words of scholars:

"No one is allowed to interpret the speech of anyone except in the way that is known to be intended, not in the way that the wording could be understood in the speech of anyone else."

(Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā, 36/7)

He also said:

"It is necessary to interpret the speech of the speaker by referring to some of his other statements, to take his words from here and there, and to understand what he usually means when using a particular word. You should know the meanings he is known to intend in other contexts. Once you understand his usual meanings and the words he uses, this can help you understand his intent. However, if he uses a word in a meaning that is not his usual practice, and abandons the meaning he typically uses, and you interpret his words in a way contrary to the meaning that is known to be his intent, this would make his words contradictory. Leaving his words to fit the rest of his speech while misrepresenting them is distorting his words and changing his intentions, and this would be a form of lying about him."

(Al-Jawāb al-Ṣaḥīḥ, 303/2)

He also said:

"Taking the opinions of the jurists from their general statements without reviewing what they have clarified in their words and what their principles imply leads to misguided views."

(Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl, p. 280, edited by Muhammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd)

This methodology was not adhered to by the writer, may Allah forgive him, in his analysis, resulting in the errors pointed out by Ibn Taymiyyah.

And Allah is the one who grants success and guidance to the straight path.

Praise be to Allah, and may peace and blessings be upon the Messenger of Allah.

Written by: Walid al-Hajj Muhammad al-Afrīqī

Completed in Dhul-Qi'dah 1441 AH.

---

[42] وجزى الله خيرا كل من راجع لي هذا الكتيب من المشايخ وطلبة العلم وأفادني بما عنده، كما استفدت من مكتبة الشاملة الحديثة أجزل الله المثوبة للقائمين عليها.

Footnote:

"May Allah reward with goodness everyone who reviewed this booklet for me from the scholars and students of knowledge, and who benefited me with what they had. I also benefited from the Shāmilah Library. May Allah grant abundant rewards to those responsible for it."
